THE RIGHTS OF *Protestant Dissenters.*

In Two Parts.

THE FIRST
Being the Case of the Dissenters Review'd.

THE SECOND
A Vindication of their Right to an Absolute Toleration, from the Objections of Sir H. MACKWORTH, in his Treatise intitled, *Peace at Home*, &c.

PART I.

The Second Edition Corrected and Enlarg'd.

With a POSTSCRIPT in defence of some Passages in it, from the Exceptions of a Postscript to a Second Letter to the Author of the *three Letters for Toleration.*

Refrain from these Men, and let them alone: for if this Counsel, or this Work be of Men, it will come to nought. But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God. Acts V. 38, 39.

LONDON, Printed in the Year M. DCC. V.
Price 1 *s.* 6 *d.*

THE

RIGHTS

OF

Protestant Dissenters.

In Two Parts.

THE FIRST

Being the Case of the Dissenters Review'd.

THE SECOND

A Vindication of their Right to all
Ecclesiastick Tolerations, and the Objections of
Sir Humphrey Mackworth, Esq; Treating intitled,
Peace at Home, &c.

PART I.

With a POSTSCRIPT in defence of some Passages in it,
from the Exceptions of a Forbidder to a Second Letter to
the Author of the three Letters for Toleration.

LONDON, Printed in the Year M.DCC.V.
Price 1s. 6d.

TO THE QUEEN'S Most Excellent Majesty.

May it please your Majesty,

THE Dissenters are fully persuaded, that Your Majesty, who does not deny Foreign States your Protection, whose Government administers Justice impartially to the Oppress'd, and whose Concern extends to the meanest of your Subjects, will not be displeas'd, that, amidst the greater Business with which the Affairs of Britain and Christendom fill up your time, you are apply'd to in behalf of a considerable Body of your People, wrong'd by Misrepresentations, that imply equal Disaffection to your Government, Ingratitude and Folly, and which, if true, wou'd justly cut them off from all pretensions to your Majesty's Protection and Favor. These are Imputations of so high a nature, that they think themselves oblig'd, in justice to your Majesty and their own Reputation, to take this method to prevent any wrong Notions concerning their Loyalty from being obtruded

on your Majesty, by any Persons whatsoever, under the false Colors of Faithfulness to your Interest and the Truth.

Your Majesty, who has had it so often publickly insinuated to You of late, that the Protestant Dissenters are Enemys to our Constitution, and dangerous to your Majesty's Government, cannot but take Satisfaction to find it contradicted; and to be assur'd, that if there are any among your People so stupid, as to be insensible of the Advantages of the best constituted Government the World can boast of, or so incredibly base as to have any ill Designs against your Majesty's Administration, unhappily fill'd up with too much Toil and Difficulty, to create the Envy, or the Dissatisfaction of your Subjects to render it uneasy to you: I say, that if there be any such, they are not so many as they have been represented, nor are the Few, that deserve this odious Character, among their Number. An Assurance that your Majesty will receive with the greater Satisfaction, inasmuch as Disloyalty would be aggravated by Ingratitude in them, who enjoy so many Blessings under your Majesty's Reign. In this the Dissenters think themselves peculiarly happy, that a Justification of their Principles, which they take to be their indispensable Duty, is not likely to be wholly ungrateful to your Majesty, at whose feet 'tis laid.

Nor will it be altogether useless to your Majesty, who find it absolutely necessary to be inform'd of the true Characters of Partys and Persons, to see the Principles of a Set of men here represented, in order to your Majesty's forming a just Judgment, whether They have any that should raise a Distrust of their Loyalty, and render it necessary for your Security, to have *a more watchful Eye over them, and to make a narrower Inspection into their Proceedings.*

And tho your Majesty has been addres'd not very long since, in a pompous Dedication, to take this Course with the Dissenters, and has had several unwarrantable and invidious Conclusions from contested Facts and Principles, suggested to You by an unknown Author, to argue the Necessity of such a Method; yet your Majesty will easily perceive, upon a Review of the innocent Principles of the Dissenters, that such Counsels can come from none, but one that is not that Friend to your Majesty's Government he pretends to be, or whose intemperate Heat has at least made him a mistaken one.

But for the Dissenters in the mean time to be silent, when such Insinuations are made to your Majesty, wou'd be confessing the Indictment; and when they are arraign'd before You, not to lodg their Answer in your hands, wou'd betray an Unconcernedness about your Opinion of 'em, and convey a Notion equally disrespectful to your Majesty and unjust to Themselves.

They beg therefore that your Majesty wou'd give 'em leave to say, that whatsoever has made it thought so seasonable by a Party of late to impeach 'em of Disloyalty, and to endeavour to incense your Majesty against 'em; yet that they are perfectly satisfy'd, that your Majesty, to whom the Common Interest of the Nation is better known, than the private Advantages of each particular Party are to it self, is fully persuaded, that it can't be for your Service to shew any distrust of Men, who have done nothing to forfeit your Majesty's Confidence, and whose Behavior of late may justly encrease it.

For they dare appeal to your Majesty, whether any were more zealous in promoting the Revolution and the Settlement of the Crown than they? or more in earnest for establishing the Protestant Succession, the Introduction to your Majesty's happy Accession to the Throne, and

the

the Security of your quiet Poſſeſſion of it? Whether any give or pay Taxes more chearfully, and that at a time when they can have no manner of private Advantage to ſerve by it, not ſo much as the innocent Principle of an honeſt Ambition, and the Proſpect of any part of the Honor of managing the War You are ſo glorioufly engag'd in, to animate 'em to contribute freely to its Support? Nay, whether any deprecate publick Calamitys, or give Almighty God the Praiſe due for National Advantages more fervently than they; tho they find that thro the narrow and factious Spirits of ſome among us, publick Diſaſters become their private Security, and common Mercys their greateſt Danger? The moſt infallible Teſt of the warmeſt Deſires of the Proſperity of your Majeſty's Arms, and the Peace and Quiet of your Government; and of an Obedience not wholly unlike the fam'd Submiſſion of Iſaac; ſince they wiſh the Succeſs and Encreaſe of your Power, and rejoice at it, under the hazard of being ſacrific'd as a Thank Offering for ſuch Divine Favors, did not your Majeſty, like the Angel, interpoſe between them and Ruin.

The Diſſenters, who, by being entirely diſengag'd from all Foreign Intereſts, can have none but that of the Nation, and muſt always therefore be ſuppos'd to be ſolicitous how that may be beſt ſerv'd, are too well appriz'd of the danger of a diſunion from Scotland upon your Majeſty's Demiſe, and the Occaſion which that unhappy Hour wou'd give thoſe that are in the Intereſt of the Pretended Prince to execute their Evil Deſigns (tho your Majeſty has receiv'd convincing Proofs, that nothing but the want of a fit Occaſion can make them wait ſo long) ever to allow themſelves to be wanting in their moſt ardent Prayers and Wiſhes, for the long Continuance of your Majeſty's Life, whom Almighty God has entruſted with a greater Opportunity to free Europe from the danger of an Univerſal

niverſal Slavery, and Us from the Fears of a Popiſh Succeſſor, than any hereafter can be reaſonably expected to be poſſeſt of.

Some former Reigns indeed have been jealous of the Diſſenters, and thought 'em dangerous; becauſe the Prince, as a late Author has aſſur'd us in a Book dedicated to your Majeſty, was a Secret Roman Catholic in the former of thoſe Reigns, and a profeſt one in the latter, and they had both of them Deſigns of introducing Popery and a Popiſh Succeſſion. In purſuance of which unhappy meaſures, they put the Diſſenters under very great Hardſhips, and commenc'd Wars, and entred into Alliances, contrary to the Genius and Intereſt of the People. But your Majeſty's Glorious Predeceſſor, who, having nothing ſo much at heart as Liberty and the Proteſtant Religion, chang'd the private Maxims of the Court for the general Good and Inclinations of his People, and the Intrigues of the Cabinet for the conſtant Advice of Free Parliaments, and who ſteadily purſu'd thoſe meaſures which were neceſſary to ſecure us from the Dangers of a Popiſh Pretender, and the exorbitant Power of France, the only dangerous Support of his Pretenſions, found the Diſſenters ready to run thro all Hazards and Difficulties, to render his Government ſecure and eaſy.

And ſince 'tis the Adminiſtration of Princes, that muſt always be ſuppos'd to procure the Love or Ill-Will of the People, the Diſſenters muſt neceſſarily bear the ſame Duty and Allegiance to Your Majeſty, as they did to the late King of Immortal Memory: Your Majeſty having not only given them your Royal Promiſe of the continuance of a Toleration, which he firſt gave; but having unwearied purſu'd his Meaſures with a Succeſs, that he could only wiſh and prepare things for; but which was reſerv'd by Providence to render your Reign Glorious, and your Memory precious to ſucceeding Times.

So

So that nothing can possibly make a Government conducted by these Maxims uneasy to the Dissenters but a Persecution, which sometimes proves a Temptation to weak and private Spirits to disturb the Publick. And tho it has been formerly the Design to provoke the Dissenters by Hardships to enter into measures, which could neither secure them, nor which they cou'd justify; yet the Passive Obedience they paid to the Laws so far defeated the Designs of their Enemys, as to force them often to accuse the Dissenters of Sham-plots to supply the want of Real ones. And the Dissenters are equally secure against such Trials of their suffering Vertues now, both by your Majesty's Penetration into the false Policys of former Reigns, your Knowledg of their ill Success, and your Royal Promise, that no such Methods shall be made use of in Yours.

The Dissenters are very well satisfy'd, that your Majesty, who is at the Head of the Protestant Interest, and not of a Party of it, has too great a Concern for its common Interest, to weaken it, by allowing a Persecution of any of that Denomination. And that You have too just a Notion of the Methods of bringing the Dissenters into the Church, to suffer any to multiply the unnecessary terms of Communion, or to use Force and Violence to make 'em Members of it. They are persuaded, that your Majesty has too much Tenderness to punish Men for that which You take to be *their Misfortune*, and not their Fault; and too much Regard to the Authority of Conscience, and the unalienable Right every Man has to a Liberty of obeying its Dictates, to let any Penalties be inflicted on Dissenters, or any Civil Priviledges accompany their Conversion; which can only tend to bribe or intimidate their Consciences, whose Integrity is the best Security your Majesty can possibly have for the dutiful Behaviour of any of your Subjects.

And

And tho there are ſome who wou'd fain have your Majeſty look upon *the Church to be a good part of the Propriety* of your Subjects, and believe that 'tis generally taken to be ſo; yet they only thereby diſcover the great Regard they have to Property, and the little Opinion that they entertain of the Church; which is infinitely debas'd by ſo mean a Similitude. And it's a ſign they don't know much of its Spiritual Nature and Privileges, and of the ways by which they are loſt and gain'd, who think that fencing it about by the ſame Laws with which we defend our Poſſeſſions can give it any Security; and deſire that it may be equally penal to invade another man's Property, or to diſſent from the Church. From the high Value theſe Men ſet upon Property, and the low and confus'd Notion they have of the Church, all wiſe Men will be apt to conclude that they rather deſign to make a Property of the Church, than the Church any part of their Property.

Your Majeſty will therefore eaſily perceive, that any Applications which are made to repreſent the Diſloyalty of the Diſſenters, and to turn your Diſpleaſure againſt 'em, if they are not owing to a furious and miſtaken Zeal, muſt proceed either from a Deſign to create a Suſpicion of the Weakneſs of your Government, to its unſpeakable Prejudice, at a time, when its Enemys are boaſting of their Strength and Numbers; or to furniſh your Enemys with a better opportunity of concerting their Meaſures without Diſcovery or Interruption; and at the ſame time to create a Coolneſs, if poſſible, in the Affections of ſome of the trueſt Friends of your Majeſty's Perſon and Government.

And theſe Deſigns Some may poſſibly flatter themſelves with the hopes of compaſſing, by the Tendencys ſuch Applications have to beget a Diffidence in your Majeſty of a faithful Part of your Subjects, and a ſecret Jealouſy in the Diſſenters of the Continuance of their Toleration; and to divert your Majeſty's Apprehenſions and Watch-

fulneſs from thoſe who depend upon a Foreign Power, and won't give the Securitys the Government requires of 'em for their dutiful Behaviour; and turn 'em upon the Diſſenters that are ready to abjure all Foreign Intereſts, and to ſwear to be faithful and true to Yours.

But whatever may be theſe mens Deſigns and Expectations, the Diſſentersare well ſatisfy'd, that their unfeign'd Obedience and your Majeſty's Wiſdom and Goodneſs will prevent their taking place. They know your Majeſty is too exactly inform'd of the many ill Effects of the Severitys us'd againſt the Diſſenters in ſome late Reigns, and of the Advantages that accru'd from the Mildneſs and Clemency of the laſt, to be ever convinc'd of the Neceſſity of keeping a ſtricter hand over them, in order to Your own Security.

Great endeavours have indeed been us'd to alienate your Majeſty's Affections from the Diſſenters, by repreſenting the unhappy Troubles of the laſt Age in falſe Colors; and making thoſe men Actors in that bloody Tragedy, who ventur'd farther in endeavouring to prevent the Fall of that Royal Head, and early to reſtore Your Royal Family during the Uſurpation, than any others dar'd to do. And to ſhew the great Good-will ſome men bear the Diſſenters, this bloody Scene is repreſented afreſh, contrary to the Acts of Grace and Oblivion, that ſhou'd have bury'd thoſe times in Silence, and to the loyal Behaviour of the Diſſenters, that ought to have procur'd 'em a more honourable mention, from all that pretend to think well of the Revolntion, or to wiſh well to your Majeſty's Reign.

But not to take up your Majeſty's time in ſetting in a true Light, what part the Diſſenters acted in thoſe Troubles, of which your Majeſty can't be ſuppos'd to want a juſt Information; none are to be blam'd for the Extravaganeys that were then committed, but they who were con-

concern'd in 'em, or they who abet 'em. And to impute any Faults of the Diſſenters of thoſe days to the Diſſenters of ours, wou'd not have quite ſo much Juſtice in it, as to puniſh Children for the Iniquity of their Forefathers.

And whoever were the Actors in thoſe Troubles, yet it is certain, as a noble Author, lately introduc'd into Your Preſence, has obſerv'd, that it was ſtraining things too far in Church and State, that rankled mens Minds, and carry'd 'em to thoſe Extremitys; and not any form'd Scheme or Set of Principles, or any previous ill Diſpoſitions that were obſervable in thoſe that engag'd in the Civil War. It was the *Unreaſonable, Unskilful, and Precipitate* Meaſures of the Court, in his Lordſhip's Opinion, that were the Source from whence thoſe Waters of Bitterneſs did moſt probably flow. So that 'tis equally improper for any to lament that they have not the power to ſcrew up things to the ſame pitch again; or to pretend, till they get that Power and exert it, that there is the leaſt ſhadow of Danger to a mild and prudent Adminiſtration, becauſe the Men of thoſe Times oppos'd the unuſual Reſolutions of the Court, by Proceedings as much without a Precedent.

It was not the Conſtitution of the Church of England that rais'd Mens paſſions at the firſt, but the Fears of Popery that they were under, from the Deſigns that it was generally thought a great Prelate had to return to the Church of Rome: Nor did they intend the Subverſion of the Eſtabliſhment of the Church, but to oppoſe the Oppreſſion and Perſecution that was either felt or apprehended: Nor was it the Ceremonys of the Church, but the introducing ſome things which look'd too like Superſtition and Prophaneneſs, that rais'd the fury in thoſe who had till then conform'd to the Church, which at laſt ended in the Ruin of its outward Order and ſome of its Superſtructures; tho its Being and Foundation, the Doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles, the Rock on which the

Church of England is built, and its chief Corner-stone, remain'd nevertheless unmov'd, thro all the Disorders of those Times.

These are Remarks which the Adversarys of the Dissenters know to be just, and which they are sensible invalidate the Charges brought against 'em from that History. That they may therefore lay a better Foundation of Distrust in your Majesty of the Dissenters Allegiance and Fidelity, they charge disloyal Principles upon the present Body of them; hoping thereby to help out a Fact, which they must needs be conscious is not at all parallel to the present State of Things, and the Guilt of which can't belong to the Dissenters now, if it did belong to some Dissenters then.

They wou'd, in order to this, possess your Majesty, that *the Monarchy of England is not now capable of being supported but upon the Principles of the Church of England*, in opposition to those of the Dissenters: *and that the Principles of the Dissenters are directly contrary to Monarchical and Episcopal Government.*

But these Assertions will make no Impression upon your Majesty, who knows that there are no Dissenters from the Principles of the Church of England about Government and Monarchy, except the Non-Jurors. The Monarchy of England at present stands upon the Principles of the late happy Revolution, in which all true Churchmen and Dissenters agree. And the only Principles that are dangerous to the Monarchy, as 'tis happily vested in your Majesty, and founded upon the Revolution, are those of Passive Obedience and the Divine Right of an unalterable Succession in the Right Line. And 'tis the Denial of *a mutual Compact between the Prince and his Subjects*; and the asserting, that *the early Death of the late Queen Mary of ever Glorious Memory, made* [immediate] *Room for your Majesty's more Unrestrain'd and Sovereign Authority*; and that *the rising up in Arms of Subjects to do themselves Right*

in

in any Controversy between them and their King, is unjustifiable, that are the Tenents which threaten the Monarchy of England as it is at present by Law establish'd. Because 'tis these that prevent the Non-Jurors in both Kingdoms from taking the Oaths to the Government, and strike at the very Root of the Abdication, and the part your Majesty bore in the Revolution, and the present Settlement of the Crown. But these Principles have never been maintain'd nor propagated in any Dissenting School or Pulpit; and are more likely to be found among those who pretend that it is for your Majesty's Interest to keep a stricter hand over the Dissenters, than among any of their Denomination, who have been so far from abetting any such Opinions, that the Opposition they have made to 'em was the great pretence for their Oppression in some former Reigns; and will, when the matter comes to be thoroughly sifted, appear to be at the bottom of the Ill-will their Enemys bear 'em in the present one.

'Tis true, The Dissenters have Principles that are contrary to an Absolute Monarchy, but those only render them better Friends to a Limited One: and 'tis Monarchy after the French, and not after the English Model, that they have constantly declar'd against. They have always indeed too remonstrated against the pretended Obligations to such an Absolute Non-Resistance, and an unlimited Passive Obedience to the Crown, as was utterly inconsistent with the Revolution-Principles, of which 'tis hard to say, whether they are more dangerous by being too weak to bear a Government, or by being specious enough to tempt Princes to trust to their Support. But in this they have help'd to discover their pernicious Fallacy and Cheat, and have had the Honesty to profess what all others never fail to practise. By doing so, and maintaining Self-preservation to be one of the first and most fundamental Laws of Nature, they have had the Honour to pave the way for

your

your Majesty's happy Accession to the Crown. So that your Majesty has at once an Instance of the Innocence and Usefulness of this Principle, in some of the most Loyal of your Subjects at Home, and of the most hearty of your Confederates Abroad, the People of the Sevennes; whom you are graciously pleas'd to assist in acting agreeably to its full Purport, to the great satisfaction of your People and your Allys.

But the Dissenters would crave the Liberty to assure your Majesty, that these free Principles, which serve to maintain the just Rights of Humanity, only render them the fitter to be free Subjects; but are so far from carrying 'em to endeavour to introduce a Commonwealth, to the Subversion of the known Constitution of this Kingdom, that they think no man a greater Enemy to England, a Jacobite only excepted, than a Republican.

What is meant by Episcopal Government, the Dissenters don't so well understand, nor how their Principles can be said to be directly contrary to it. They would hope, that 'tis not made any Matter of Accusation against 'em, that they do not believe the Powers of the Bishops to be Independent from the State, or that any Injustice has been done to the ejected Ones; which are indeed held to be as necessary Tenents by some now-a-days, as any contain'd in our Catechisms. Nor can the Dissenters tell what other meaning this Charge can have, in which they can be concern'd. They believe your Majesty to be Supreme in all Causes Civil and Ecclesiastical. They hold the Order of Bishops to be lawful, tho they do not take it to be Divine. And it may be those, who would gladly irritate your Majesty against the Dissenters, would not be better pleas'd with them, if they should hear them profess a great deal of Veneration for their Lordships Persons, and assure your Majesty, as they might do with the greatest Sincerity, that they think it one of the most valuable

luable Bleſſings of your Reign, that you have ſuch a Bench of Biſhops to ſummon to Parliament, to adviſe your Majeſty about the great and arduous Affairs of the Kingdom. And ſince your Majeſty has given your Royal Aſſurances, that You will maintain a Toleration granted to their Scruples about taking Orders from a Biſhop, according to the preſent manner of conferring 'em, or about committing themſelves to his ſpiritual Care; 'tis to be hop'd none will think it a Crime in the Diſſenters, that they uſe a Liberty, which while their Scruples remain, the Law of God indiſpenſably enjoins, and your Majeſty's Government graciouſly allows.

But if the Principles of the Diſſenters were as inconſiſtent with the Order of Biſhops as their Enemy's wou'd repreſent 'em to be; yet the Diſſenters are ſatisfy'd, that this wou'd not infer the Concluſion 'tis deſign'd to ſuggeſt, and convince your Majeſty of the Diſloyalty of the Diſſenters: who find your Self, by the dutiful Behaviour of the Presbyterians of Scotland, ſo happily convinc'd on the one hand of the Falſity of that fam'd Maxim, No Biſhop, No King; and by the ill Conduct of the Epiſcopal Party there, on the other, that ſome may be unalterably ſet upon Biſhops, and againſt their rightful Sovereign at the ſame time.

Your Majeſty will eaſily acquit the Diſſenters from Charges of this nature, which as they are capable of the moſt ſatisfactory Anſwers, ſo are they ſupported by no Proof but that of a Fact, which it ſelf has no Evidence of its Truth; and which if it had, affects none but thoſe ſingle Perſons who ſhall be prov'd to be concern'd in it: I mean the *ſolemnizing of that diſmal Thirtieth of January, in Scandalous and Opprobrious Feaſting and Jeſting.* A Rite ſo barbarous and inhuman, as is the inſulting the Memory of a Vertuous and Unfortunate Prince, that I wou'd hope none that breathe the ſame Air with your Majeſty can be

guilty

guilty of it: But which the Diſſenters know nothing more of than their *Accuſers*, and are more ſorry, that there is the leaſt Suſpicion of ſuch a Crime's being perpetrated by any of their Countrymen, than their Accuſers can be glad, that it ſerves as a Reproach to any of their Number. If any ſuch Solemnity ſhould be practis'd in ſecret, the Diſſenters hope the Promoters of it will be diſcover'd: And if it ſhould appear that any of 'em were Diſſenters, which is a Suſpicion altogether as groundleſs as they believe 'tis falſe, yet this cou'd no more argue the Body of the Diſſenters guilty of *Retaining the Rebellious Principles of the laſt Age*, than it cou'd be concluded that all Churchmen were Jacobites, if it ſhould be prov'd, that ſome of that Body have with the like Barbarity drunk Healths and paid Honors to a couple of Animals, for occaſioning the Death of one of the beſt of Princes.

In the mean while your Majeſty will eaſily obſerve how juſtly the Diſſenters dread the falling into the hands of thoſe men, who wou'd puniſh 'em for the Crimes of their Predeceſſors, and wou'd impute the Iniquity of a Fact without Evidence to a whole Body, whoſe Guilt is not ſo much as ſuſpected to affect any conſiderable Number.

Since upon the whole then it appears, that the Diſſenters have ſo many Principles and Intereſts concurring to ſecure your Majeſty of their Fidelity; and ſince they have done no Fact, nor hold any Principles that can raiſe a Diſtruſt of them in your Majeſty, They promiſe themſelves, that you will by no means be engag'd either to hinder the Continuance of the Diſſenting Aſſemblys to the next Generation, or to deprive 'em of any Powers and Capacitys of ſerving your Majeſty and their Country, which they now enjoy.

The utmoſt of their Wiſhes is a farther Advance towards the firſt deſign'd Reformation of the Church,

which

which no body pretends is already perfect. And in case they can't obtain this by peaceable and legal Methods, the utmost they desire is a Continuance of the Toleration of their own Religious Societys, in which they think that Reformation is in a good measure obtain'd. If in this they conceive amiss, they hope your Majesty will imitate the great Head of the Church, and bear with their involuntary Mistake.

This they humbly ask with the greater Confidence, because they are conscious of their unbiass'd Designs to use every Power that shall be continued to 'em, and to exert themselves to the utmost in every Capacity for the Service of your Majesty and their Country. And therefore they hope they may presume, that You will not hearken to a later Author, who wou'd persuade your Majesty to deprive 'em of Opportunitys of Service, which they hope will be ever as useful to your Majesty, as they will be always honourable and agreeable to Them. They have the less reason to be apprehensive of His succeeding with your Majesty, since to the infinite Satisfaction of your People, You have express'd too great a Concern for a general Union among 'em, and know the best Methods to obtain it too accurately, to encourage any Measures, the remote Jealousys and Apprehensions whereof have more than once caus'd a Ferment and Convulsion, that has reach'd to the most distant Parts of the Kingdom.

The Dissenters beg your Majesty to believe, that 'tis only these Men, who thus misrepresent 'em, and wou'd advise your Majesty to take severe Measures with 'em, that they wou'd oppose in their several Stations; and that more for endeavouring to bring Difficultys and Uneasiness upon your Majesty and the Public, than upon Themselves. And your Majesty, who quickly sees thro the Pretences of those that approach You, will easily discern, that 'tis not any Principles of Disloyalty to your Majesty,

but a ſteddy Adherence to the true Intereſt of your Majeſty and of the Proteſtant Succeſſion, and to Meaſures that won't ſo eaſily fall in with ſome mens private Deſigns, that has rais'd this Cry againſt 'em. Had it not been for this, your Majeſty might poſſibly have found their preſent Accuſers their greateſt Patrons and Protectors.

May the Almighty, by whom Kings reign and Princes decree Juſtice, bleſs your Majeſty with the Diſcernment of an Angel of God: and in order to render your Majeſty's Government eaſy to Your ſelf and a continued Bleſſing to your People, vouchſafe to your Majeſty the Knowledg of the true Friends and Enemys of your Perſon and Government; and grant that You may never truſt any one of Theſe, nor diſtruſt any one of the Other.

THE

The PREFACE.

THE Cauſe that the World is now deſir'd to give Judgment in, has been more than once publickly and ſucceſsfully argu'd: And ſince I pray a Rehearing, 'tis but juſt that I ſhould have ſo much deference to Mankind, the Judges to whom I appeal, as not to lodge it before I have ſuggeſted thoſe Reaſons which induc'd me to draw it up, and to hope that it would not be thought a piece of Impertinence and Preſumption to deſire a Review.

The Toleration of Diſſenters has got ſo much Credit of late, by the Evidence that has been brought of the Title every one has to it, and the great Advantages it brings along with it to all Governments, that it is become a ſort of fundamental Maxim of ours, and an eſſential Part of the Conſtitution. Inſomuch that an Attempt, which all unbiaſs'd Men took to be made to weaken and impair the Toleration, was prefac'd with a ſolemn Aſſurance, that it ought to be inviolably obſerv'd.

Right and Public Advantage indeed are always Arguments to honeſt Minds, and engage 'em to purſue every thing that comes under that Repreſentation. But to Party-men, who always act from private views, they only ſerve as Cautions againſt a publick Oppoſition of that which makes ſo advantageous an Appearance, and as a Hint to pretend to promote it or to oppoſe it ſecretly, whenever 'tis neceſſary, in order to compaſs their little Ends, to oppoſe it at all.

And this has been the Reaſon why ſome, who find the Diſſenters to be a Party that thwart their private Intereſts, either profeſs to maintain the Toleration, or don't own any Deſign to repeal it, at the ſame time that they diſcover themſelves to diſcerning Men, to be reſolutely bent upon thoſe meaſures, which will gradually weaken and deſtroy it.

This Attempt upon the Toleration under a pretence of Friendſhip, or at leaſt without declaring open War againſt it, endangers the Toleration much more than any Public Acts of Hoſtility poſſibly could; ſince by theſe means the Diſſenters are lull'd aſleep, or are not any ways alarm'd to ward off the Blow.

But ſince 'tis plain that the Occaſional Conformiſts are only attack'd like a thinner Squadron, that the whole Body of the Diſſenters may be the more ſucceſsfully routed; and that 'tis endeavour'd to deprive 'em of all Offices, for no other purpoſe, than that by taking this Outwork of the Toleration, the Fort may be the more eaſily ſtorm'd; 'tis high time that the Redoubts ſhould be ſtrengthened, and the Avenues well guarded and ſecur'd.

This is a time when no Man that wishes well to the Toleration of Dissenters, can think it improper to Review the Whole of their Case, to be appriz'd of what they hold to be their Obligations, what they claim as their Due, and what they take to be the Interest of their Country in reference to Themselves; and to find proper Arguments and Answers drawn from the general Principles of an absolute and impartial Toleration of all Dissenters, accommodated to the Case of the Occasional Conformists, and to the Exceptions that are made to the Pleas for their Toleration.

And since Sir H. M. has endeavour'd to defeat the Occasional Conformists of the Right they have to a Toleration, in common with other Dissenters, and pretends that they ought not to be suffer'd to enjoy it; it's but a piece of common Justice to allow the Occasional Conformists to put in their Answer. And there's the more reason for it, since Sir H's Performance has been cry'd up by some Interested Men, as a Masterpiece, and uncapable of receiving a Satisfactory Answer.

*What engag'd me too the more to make a Reply to it, was the greater Success this Treatise has met with than Sir H's Bookseller complains * his former one did; which argu'd a great Disposition in some People to receive any Arguments, that were brought on that side the Question, and the want of some Remedy to cure that ill Disposition.*

The Reader will I hope forgive me, for exceeding the just Bounds of a Pamphlet. But whoever makes fair Quotations from Sir H. M. will quickly swell a Book: And Sir H. not any where determining his Notions, and leaving it to his Reader to fix his meaning from the Design of his Treatise, the Connexion of the Place, or some parallel Passages scatter'd up and down his Book (all of which being consulted, sometimes leave the Difficulty unresolv'd) renders it often necessary to make several Quotations and Deductions to settle the Sense of a single Proposition, which the Answerer is to debate. So that I must needs say, it has been generally more difficult to determine the exact Signification of Sir H's Assertions, than to refute 'em.

However I have endeavour'd to make the Reader amends as well as I cou'd; and therefore, where I was not so certain of Sir H's meaning, I have fix'd that upon his Words, which according to my Apprehensions wou'd best serve his purpose. And I have endeavour'd not only to answer what Sir H. has said, but what might have been said, as a further Proof of what he advances.

That all this was not sooner done and publish'd (besides its being some considerable time after Sir H's Book appear'd, before that Acceptance which its several Editions in various Forms argue it has met with, cou'd be known, the great reason of my answering it) is owing to some little Accidents of Indisposition and other Interruptions, which 'tis neither worth my while particularly to relate, nor my Reader's to be inform'd of.

* *See the Pref. to his* Treatise *concerning the Doctrine of the* Ever-blessed Trinity: *by way of Dialogue.*

THE

THE CASE OF THE DISSENTERS REVIEW'D.

THERE's no man that makes the leaſt Reflection on the Perſons and Things of his own time, but muſt neceſſarily obſerve with how great eagerneſs and frequency the Diſſenters have been attack'd of late, and with how much reluctancy they are brought to reply. I know the Reaſons of this Conduct are differently thought of and repreſented, as the Reaſons of moſt Facts are, according to Mens different Intereſts or Prepoſſeſſions. But no body can be juſtly ſurpriz'd at this Procedure, who obſerves, that Diſputes generally prove either ineffectual to ſerve the common Intereſts of Society and Religion, or prejudicial to them both. And that they who engage in 'em muſt be Men of great Leiſure and Receſs from other buſineſs. For as Controverſy takes up a great deal of time; ſo it commonly gives an Edge to Mens Minds and Expreſſions, and provokes 'em to break the Tys of Love and Charity, the Band of Civil and Religious Perfection. It raiſes too much Paſſion againſt our Adverſary, and a greater concern for our ſelves than for the Truth; and robs us of that Sedateneſs of Mind, in which alone Truth can maintain its own Empire, or get the better of the Arts of

Falſhood

Falshood. So that whilst Controversy is like to do so little good, and, without a great deal of caution in managing it, so much harm, he must be a very idle Fellow indeed, and be capable of little service otherwise, that can be forward to engage in it.

But possibly the Dissenters think, that they had the less Obligation to appear in their own Defence, because they thought their Conduct spoke for it self. And they were more willing the World should see their Innocence expres'd in their Actions than in their Apologys and Vindications; and that their Enemys shou'd find their own Mouths stop'd by the Dissenters blameless Behavior, rather than by Recriminations and Answers. And they had flatter'd themselves, that their Conduct must necessarily have acquitted 'em from the Charges that us'd to be made against 'em. For they imagin'd, after they had been more faulty in some Peoples Opinions for supporting a Prince than for dethroning one, their Loyalty wou'd scarce have been call'd again in question: Nor their Charity, after they had so frequently conform'd upon Occasion to the Church of England, at her Invitation to do it, and her Complaint against the Neglect of it *. Nor their Sincerity in this Practice, when 'tis known that they took it up before any shew of Interest cou'd tempt them to it: and that they continue it, when they are told by their Enemys that it must disserve their Party; and by their Friends, that it can serve none but that of the truly Christian one.

Mr. Calamy's Abridgment of Mr. Baxter's Life, p. 566.

The account of the Lds Proceedings, p. 31.

* *Dr. Stillingfleet in a Sermon preach'd before the Lord Mayor, entitul'd,* The Mischief of Separation, *complains, after he had said, that the Dissenters hold Communion with the Church of England in the Liturgy and Sacraments lawful, and in some Cases a Duty;* 'that they shou'd not join with the Church, *in what* 'they themselves thought lawful, and *in some Cases a Duty.*' *And complains,* 'that the Preachers keep this Doctrine of the lawfulness of a Dissenter's joining in 'the publick Assemblys, a secret in their own Breasts.' *And adds,* 'that if those 'Preachers wou'd acquit themselves like honest and conscientious men, they must 'tell the People plainly, that they look on our Churches as lawful Churches.' *This last is a very particular Invitation to Occasional Conformity, and a heavy Complaint upon the Preachers for their silence about it, as the Cause of their Peoples neglect of it. Tho that by the way is a strange Charge for the Doctor to make against the Preachers, when he had but just quoted a Book of theirs, that positively declar'd it to the World as their Opinion, that Occasional Conformity was not only Lawful but a Duty.*

Pag. 21.

P. 22. §. 4.

P. 37.

P. 30, 56.

P. 22.

They

They thought therefore if these Facts wou'd not justify 'em, it was only because they were not obsery'd, nor the Reason of 'em not attended to; and that it wou'd be sufficient, if they shou'd just set 'em in a fair Light, to give the World satisfaction. Or that at least if Reason wou'd not be heard in the mouths of Partys, it wou'd have its just regard when it came from those impartial Judges, to whom injur'd Justice has its last Resort: Who, as all just Judges do, turn'd Advocates in this honest Cause, and pleaded the Rights of the Oppress'd. They saw their Lordships Defence of 'em wou'd increase the Credit and Authority their Lordships justly stand possess'd of, and needed not the just Opinion the People of England have of 'em, to give their Lordships Reasons their full weight: and that nothing cou'd add to that, unless it were, that others were so light and trivial. 'It was said indeed, that if things 'went on as they did, the Church wou'd be in danger for the 'future. For that the Dissenters had been Seditious, and 'that they continu'd to be Schismaticks; and had of late 'Hypocritically found out a Practice, which was equally incon-'sistent with the Laws and their own Principles. Whence 'it was infer'd, that the Dissenters ought to be incapacita-'ted for all Offices, for the security of the Church: Especially 'since they might be incapacitated, without giving the Church 'one Advantage it had not, or without depriving the Dissen-'ters of one they had. For as restraining Dissenters 'from Offices was manifestly design'd by the Corporation 'and Test Acts, so that Restraint was not remov'd by the 'Act of Toleration, nor desir'd by the best of the Dissenters 'themselves.

But how specious soever these Objections might appear at first, the Dissenters thought they cou'd not remain so, after it had been advanc'd in answer: 'That the Church was in 'no present danger, and but in an imaginary one for the fu-'ture. Which might be the more justly asserted, since the 'Church had been secure and flourishing for many Years, in 'the condition in which it is at present, without any new 'Security. That since the Dissenters were tolerated, they 'cou'd not be thought Schismaticks: And that if they had 'been Seditious, 'twas when Persecution had made 'em o-'pen Enemys. But as their Independence from foreign 'Power,

See the Lords Proceedings upon the Occasional Conformity Bill.

'Power, and the Smallness of their Numbers compar'd with 'that of the Church, secur'd 'em from being dangerous; 'so gentler Methods had made 'em true Friends to the Go-'vernment both in Church and State. That Occasional Con-'formity was a Practice antienter than the Test Act, tho it 'was but of late that any Objections had been made against 'it: And that it was not inconsistent for a man that cou'd 'conform in some Instances, to have a weak and a scrupulous 'Conscience, that wou'd not let him conform in others. 'Hence they infer'd, that it wou'd be unreasonable to disturb 'the Publick Peace in so critical a Juncture; and that since 'a Toleration had done Service to Church and State, it ought 'to be preserv'd and strengthen'd rather than endanger'd 'and impair'd. That if the Bill made no Alteration to the 'prejudice of the Dissenters, it wou'd be ineffectual: and 'if it did, it wou'd be hard to punish Men for going to a 'Meeting, which as the Law stands is no Crime. That the 'Corporation Act cou'd not be pleaded as a Precedent for 'this, because the Circumstances of the Times made it wide-'ly different. And that this Bill cou'd not be said to oblige 'the best, and disoblige only the worst among the Dissenters, 'unless they were the worst among the Dissenters who were 'nearest to the Church, and they the best who were at the 'greatest distance.

Thus Imaginary Dangers of the Church and Old Crimes of the Dissenters have been set forth at large, in order to justify the Conduct of those who wou'd have incapacitated them for all Employments. Whilst the noble Patrons rais'd up by Providence for their Defence, whom the World has so much reason to rely upon, and so little to suspect, have given us the real Advantages of Church and State, and the late Behavior of the Dissenters, as the reasons of taking 'em under their Protection. A greater advantage in arguing can hardly be suppos'd, whether we consider the Abilitys of the Disputants, or the Issue of the Dispute. And since such an entire Defeat of the best Forces and Artillery that cou'd be brought out by the other side, has only gain'd the Dissenters and Moderate Churchmen a Truce, till the Forces cou'd rally again, what lasting Advantage can be expected from an Encounter between two single Combatants, tho' Truth and Suc-

cess shou'd be on our side? However since we are not only challeng'd by a Champion of the other Party, but urg'd by the Friends of our own; and since, tho 'tis scarce to be hop'd that Victory cou'd procure Peace, yet that Silence might be thought to betray Cowardice; we think our selves oblig'd to enter the Lists, that if we can serve no better a purpose, we may at least prevent our Adversarys from telling the World, that we have given up the Cause of Toleration, or others from taking the occasion to suspect we have betray'd it.

In order to this, it may possibly be worth the while to take a summary view of what the Dissenters have advanc'd in their own Defence, and what Exceptions have been made to it, before we consider what has been alledg'd against 'em. And under the first Head we'l take a short view of the *Reasons of their Dissent* from the Establish'd Church, *of their Occasional Conformity*, of the *Right they* have to a Toleration, and the *Interest* the *Government* has to maintain it. What comes under the other Head, we shall reserve to the Second Part of this Discourse.

The Reasons of their *stated Dissent* amount to this, that the Worship due to God, being the Payment of that Honor, which a reasonable Creature ows his Maker, must be such, as the reasonable Creature thinks suitable to that relation, and which he thinks will be acceptable when 'tis paid. To give God either what we think wou'd be unacceptable, or less acceptable than something else that is in our Power to give, wou'd be to offer him an Affront instead of Homage, and must procure his Resentment instead of his Acceptance. And as not to worship God at all is to turn Atheist; so not to worship him in that manner which we think will please him best, is to become as much worse than an Atheist, as to outrage and insult the Deity is worse than to neglect it. Whence it follows, that whilst the Dissenters think their way of Worship more acceptable to God, than that establish'd by Law; 'tis impossible for them not to remain

Dissenters, unless they'l turn *Atheists*, and not worship God at all; or *Hypocrites*, and not worship him in that which they take to be the most acceptable manner.

It makes nothing to our present purpose, whether the Dissenters are mistaken, in thinking their manner of worshipping God more acceptable to him than that establish'd by Law, or not. For supposing them to be mistaken, whilst they act as honest Men, they must act according to their own Apprehensions. He's indeed a wise Man, whose Apprehensions are free from Mistakes: But no man can act as an honest Man, and a good Christian, who acts contrary to his Apprehensions, be they just or mistaken *. But the Dissenters think they are not without Reason to support their Opinion neither: Their Dissent includes two things, a Separation from the Establish'd Church, and a joining themselves to other Christian Societys. And they think 'tis a part of the Duty they owe to Jesus Christ their Lord and Lawgiver to do both. For they take it to be an Instance of the Allegiance due to Him, to separate from a Church, which abridges 'em of any Liberty he has allow'd, or allows 'em any which he has forbid; or in which they are not likely to meet with the earliest Convictions of any Fault that Church may be guilty of, in either of these respects, or in which they are not likely to be in the greatest readiness to comply with all Attempts towards a further Reformation. And as

---

* *Lest the Cause in which this is asserted, should made it suspected of Heterodoxy, I wou'd beg leave to quote the words of a very judicious and most Reverend Prelate, in a Discourse concerning Conscience in Quarto:* 'Where a Man, says he, is mistaken in
P. 18. 'his Judgment, even in that Case it is always a Sin to act against it. Tho we should 'take that for a Duty which is really a Sin, yet so long as we are thus persuaded, 'it will be highly criminal in us to act in contradiction to this Persuasion. And the 'reason of this is evident, because by so doing, we wilfully act against the best 'Light, which at present we have for the direction of our Actions. So that when 'all is done, the immediate Guide of our Actions can be nothing but our Conscience, 'our Judgment and Persuasion.' *And he adds a little after:* 'If a Papist shou'd 'renounce the Communion of the Roman Church, and join with ours, whilst yet he 'is persuaded the Roman Church is the only Catholick Church, and that our Re-'form'd Churches are Heretical or Schismatical; tho now there is none of us that 'will deny that the Man in this Case has made a good Change, as having chang'd 'a false Religon for a true one; yet for all that, I dare say, we should all agree 'he was a great Villain for making that Change, because he made it not upon honest 'Principles, and in pursuance of his Judgment, but in direct contradiction to both.

they

they think it their indispensable Duty to separate from such a Church, so they think they have an equal Obligation to join with those Churches, which are not liable to these Complaints; and where besides they are both likely to meet with what they take to be the most proper means to increase their Christian Knowledg and Vertue, and to labor under the fewest Defects.

I. The Dissenters think it necessary to separate from a Church, which has so many unnecessary Rites and Ceremonys, to assert their *Freedom* from all *human Impositions*, which they take to be an Encroachment on the Divine Right our Lord and Saviour has to give Laws to his Church, and an Intrenchment upon the Libertys of his Subjects, an Alteration of Religion, and a Constituting something else necessary to please God, besides that which he has made so. And they take themselves to be more strongly oblig'd to assert their Liberty against some Impositions than against others; inasmuch as some, in their Opinion, are not only novel and fanciful, but *Corrupt* too. To instance in both these Cases: To enact, that no Man shall receive the Sacrament, unless he kneels, is an Usurpation upon Mens Consciences, and an Authority no Commission can be produc'd to support *. But to wrest any Powers by Ecclesiastical By-Laws out of Hands where God has lodg'd 'em, either in Familys, or in Churches, and particular Church-Officers, is in their Opinion too like actual Rebellion, and setting up a Jurisdiction directly Opposite to his.

II. The Dissenters think the Reformation of Faith and Worship from all the Innovations and Corruptions, which the Fancys and Interests of Men have introduc'd, the most glorious Work of these latter Ages. They envy their Forefathers the Honor of having set it on foot, and are not so ambitious of any thing, as of carrying on what they began to a greater perfection, and of imitating their happy Spirit, in removing those things, in order to win upon Protestant Dissenters, which their Ancestors suffer'd to remain, only to bring over the Ro-

* *Note, That complying now and then with an Ecclesiastical Usurpation in things indifferent, is not complying with the Principle upon which that Usurpation is founded. See this more particularly explain'd, p.* 31. *where the Consistency of Occasional Conformity, with this reason of Separation, is shewn more at large.*

man Catholics. And since the Dissenters can't think the *Reformation Perfect*, they think themselves oblig'd to separate from a Church, in which they were to be prevented by an Oath from endeavoring after any Alterations. Neither wou'd they so much as suffer their Eyes to be blinded, and a Veil to be drawn over the Blemishes of the Church by its Emoluments and Honors: Nor to be directed to the Laws of Men as its Rule and Standard, rather than to the Laws of God; nor their Hands to be cramp'd, and ty'd up by the Restrictions of human Orders, from acting agreeably to the Light they shou'd receive; which will shine the clearest, if we follow the Advice of the Arabian Proverb, and if in order to see, 'we shut the Windows.' Truth will then be the purest and the freest from mixtures of Passion and Interest, if we resolve to exclude the views of Worldly Honors and Privileges, and consult the Reasonings of our own Consciences, upon the Principles that the Light of Nature or Revelation affords us.

III. The Dissenters think these Reasons oblige them by a direct and an immediate consequence to separate from the Establish'd Church, and *imply* their Obligation to join with other Churches; since they cannot, without a manifest Disobedience to their Lord, and a loss of several Privileges that are not to be had out of Religious Societys, live without entring into some Religious Society or other.

IV. But the immediate Obligation that lies upon 'em to do so, in their opinion arises from hence, that their Churches have some spiritual Advantages, which the Church of England wants. For since nothing can do God more honor than a serious Endeavor to become knowing and vertuous; and since 'tis a much more likely way to become so, to choose their own Teachers, than to have them impos'd upon 'em by another, they think 'tis most highly reasonable, that they shou'd join with Churches, whose Constitution allows of such a *Choice*. For no Man can be so capable to judg who informs another the best of the Truth, and of his Obligations, and animates him the most to a correspondent Life and Conversation, as he is himself; and when a Man chooses his Teacher, he may be sure that he is disinterested in his Choice; whereas he can't be sure, when another chooses for him, that the other has no separate Interest to serve from his: And he can't but be sure, that the other

other does not know the Methods that are so proper to serve his spiritual Interests, so well as he does himself. Because that does not depend intirely upon the Abilitys of the Preacher, of which another might judg as well as he; but upon the Proportion they bear to his Capacity, which none can judg of but himself, who knows his own Capacity, as well as the Ability of the Preacher, and the Sutableness of the one to the other.

V. But God has appointed Reproof and Correction, as a proper means to a Holy Life, as well as Exhortation and Instruction. But this Advantage they think is in a manner wholly wanting in the Establish'd Church; tho Discipline is as necessary to a well order'd Church, as Administration of Justice is to a good Government. Whether the Defect of this due Discipline in the Church, be owing to the want of good Orders, or of a good Constitution to execute them, or to both, is not material. The *Defect of a godly Discipline* is acknowledg'd and lamented by the Church; and the Dissenters hope restor'd by them. If it be not, the fault they are sure is in themselves, and not in their Churches, by whose Rules and Constitutions it may be attain'd. And this being a compliance with the Church infinitely more conducive to the Ends of a Religious Society, which is the holy Lives of its Members, than any compliance with Ceremonys, or subjection to the Order of Bishops can be, which are not necessarily conducive to that end; the Dissenters hope erecting Churches of their own, is both more necessary, and a greater compliance with the Church, than their Conformity cou'd be. So that upon the whole, 'tis to maintain the Liberty of a Christian, and the Purity of Christian Worship, that the Dissenters separate from the Establish'd Church; and both by consequence from these, and more immediately for greater Improvements, and a godly Discipline, that they unite in religious Confederacys among themselves.

Common-Prayer-Book at the beginning of the Commination, being the Office for Ash-Wednesday.

Upon these Principles some of the Dissenters think they ought not only to enter into Religious Confederacys among themselves, but to *separate* from the Church *Intirely* and *at All Times*. It wou'd be foreign to our present Design to enquire whether that be the just Consequence of these Principles: but every Man must judg of Principles and Consequences for himself;

self; and he that thinks the Conclusion from these Premises to be an obligation to a total and constant Separation from the Church, can't join with her in any part of Worship, at any time, without acting a dishonest part, and refusing to follow his Judgment, the immediate Guide that God has appointed to all his Actions. Whether the Dissenter that constantly and totally separates from the Church, acts according to his Judgment, and whether he did all he could to inform his Judgment, is no Man's business to judg and determine: and he only that has a right to judg him, or that can do it, is the Lord.

I. But there are others among the Dissenters, who think, that tho they are oblig'd by virtue of these Principles to join with separate Christian Societys, yet that they ought to join with the Church of England in some parts of her Worship, upon some Occasions too: Because they think the Church of England a Good and a Lawful Church, tho she is Defective and Redundant; and tho they think their own Churches Preferable, and the Best. They think the Churchmen too guilty of introducing some Impositions and Superfluitys, and of allowing several Defects in the Church, which if they should be guilty of, would be Sins against their Consciences in them. Yet they believe great numbers of the Churchmen to be among the visible Saints on Earth, and that they will make a good part of the Church of the First-born in Heaven. For they have the same Charity for the Churchmen, which they desire the Churchmen to have for them; and believe that to be but Inconsideratenes and Mistake in their Brethren, which wou'd in their Opinion be a design'd neglect of Religion, a formal Usurpation of God's Authority, and an actual Rebellion in themselves. The Parts of Worship therefore, in which the Dissenters can join with the Church and the Churchmen, are those which they do not condemn, either as Faults in the Church, or Mistakes in the Churchmen, or as what wou'd be Sins against Conscience in themselves; and from which by consequence they don't separate: And the Occasions of conforming are those, in which they can do the Church, or their Country, or Religion any Service. And since 'tis a necessary Character of an honest Man to act according to his Principles, and that some Dissenters have these, they cou'd not possibly act like honest Men, if

if they did not *Statedly Dissent*, and *Partially and Occasionally Conform.*

II. And as these Principles necessarily oblige 'em to do so, so they don't see that any of *their* other *Principles forbid* 'em to do it. They think indeed the two last of the Reasons of their Separation, oblige 'em to enter into Religious Societys of their own, but that the two former don't oblige 'em never to join with the Church, but only in those things, which they condemn, and from which they separate. They can therefore never join in any Impositions, Corruptions, or Defects of the Church; but this does not hinder 'em from joining in other Parts of the Establish'd Worship, which are not faulty in these Respects. As for instance, the Reasons that are given for a Separation from the Church, don't make it unlawful for a Dissenter to receive the Lord's Supper kneeling; Kneeling being a Posture at that Solemnity perfectly indifferent, and which they may therefore use if they think fit. Nor does the Imposition alter its nature, and of an indifferent one make it unlawful. But all that the Imposition operates, is, that it self being in the opinion of the Dissenters unlawful, must debar them from joining in it, concurring to it, abetting it, and giving it any countenance; which constant receiving of the Sacrament kneeling in their Opinion wou'd do, and an occasional receiving of it in the same Posture does not. It being therefore the Imposition of a thing indifferent that an Occasional Conformist separates from, and not the indifferent thing impos'd, 'tis only from the former he must constantly separate, but not at all times from the latter. And as this general Rule may be easily drawn from this Instance, so 'twill not be difficult to the Reader to form Parallel Rules to this, in the other cases.

From hence 'tis easy, with great Submission, to observe the *Mistake* of those who assert, that 'the Occasional Conformists 'conform to that from which they dissent, and condemn 'themselves in that which they allow, and are guilty of a wil-'ful Sin. Since 'tis Impositions, Corruptions and Defects, they separate from and condemn, and only join upon occasion with an indifferent thing impos'd. And with Sir H. M's leave, 'Conforming and Non-conforming are not Contradictions,' unless it be Conforming and Non-conforming to the very same things, and at all times. But to Conform to some things, and

Sir H. M's Peace at Home, B. p. 6. §. 5, 6.

Ibid.

and at some times, and to Dissent from other things, and at other times, is a Practice that contradicts it self no more than to eat Flesh, and not to eat Flesh. And I suppose a Man who liv'd in a Popish Country might eat Flesh on a Wednesday and Friday constantly at his own House, and Fish sometimes upon those days at his Neighbour's: And that a believing Corinthian might eat Meats offer'd to Idols at an Idolater's private Table, if it was not notify'd to him that they were Meats offer'd to Idols; and might not eat 'em if it was, without a self-Contradiction.

III. And as the Dissenters think Occasional Conformity on these accounts to be a Practice built upon the Belief of the Communion of Saints, and enjoyn'd by the Rule of Charity, and to be highly consistent with their own Principles, so they think it warranted by *Apostolical Example*. For St. Paul held Communion Statedly with Societys of converted Gentiles, who had no terms of Communion but the terms of Salvation; and Occasionally with the Establish'd Church of the Jews, whose Constitution and Worship was widely different from those Societys. For tho the converted Jews reform'd from the Doctrines, yet they retain'd the unnecessary Ceremonys and Constitution of the Jewish Church. Which being enjoin'd by God but for a term of time, which was then expir'd, became indifferent things in their own nature; but were impos'd by the Governors of the Jewish Church, and made so necessary by their Imposition, that the Churches with whom St. Paul did statedly communicate, were held Schismatical Assemblys for the neglect of 'em. And yet notwithstanding this Stated Dissent of St. Paul from the Establish'd Church, he did Partially Conform himself, and advis'd others to do the like upon all occasions, where the Jewish Church or the Gospel could be serv'd by it. Till therefore it can be prov'd that the Establish'd Church of the Reform'd Jews, and the Dissenting Assemblys of the Reform'd Gentiles don't bear a proportion to the Establish'd and Dissenting Churches in England; or that the Reasons of St. Paul's Stated Dissent and Occasional Conformity don't bear an exact proportion to the Stated Separation and Occasional Conformity of the Dissenters, They desire to be excus'd, if they take this to be an Apostolical Example, which they are oblig'd to imitate, tho there be a thousand other disproportions and differences betwixt 'em.

The

The Dissenters can't forbear thinking too, that the *Occasional Non conformity* of a Church man is founded *mutatis mutandis* on the same Principles with the Occasional Conformity of the Dissenters; and will, according to the Rule of Contrarys, serve to illustrate and prove each other. They can't but believe that a Church man, who thinks the Churches of Dissenters good and lawful, and the Church of England the best, ought whilst he thinks so to communicate Occasionally with the Dissenters, and Statedly with the Church: And that this Practice is an inevitable consequence from these Principles, and supported by Apostolical Example too. St. Peter, a stated Communicant with the Jewish Church establish'd by Law, reform'd from Jewish Doctrines, but not at all from the Jewish Ceremonys and Constitution; did Communicate upon Occasion with separate Assemblys of Reform'd Gentiles, who were for some time held Schismatical, because they would not suffer the Ceremonys nor Constitution of the Jewish Church to be impos'd upon 'em, tho mightily urg'd to receive 'em by the Governors of that Church. And the Dissimulation and Hypocrisy which St. Paul charg'd upon St. Peter, was not that he was an Occasional Nonconformist, but that he was afraid to continue one. He did not blame him for that before certain Jews came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but that when they came, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing those of the Circumcision. Gal. 2.12.

And there are yet others who ly between these two, and are something like Diogenes, that would not be made a Citizen of Athens by certain peculiar Rites, because he was a Citizen of the World. These Men don't think the Church or the Meetings Unlawful, or Preferable one to the other. They think Orders equally valid that are given by Bishops, Presbyters, or a Congregation: and 'tis indifferent to them, whether they pray by a Form or without. When they have Communion with any Church, 'tis with that Church as a part of the Catholick one; and it's of no importance to them by what little Peculiaritys each of these parts has differenc'd it self from the rest. They take none of the Differences to be either Sinful or Divine; and think Religion and true Piety may be alike promoted by 'em all. And according to these Principles, they frequent the Communion of Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Con-

gregational Churches, *Indifferently*, as Circumstances and Occasions happen to determine and invite. In which they act too as correspondently to their Principles as either of the former.

IV. And after all the Clamors that have been made against Occasional Conformity and Occasional Nonconformity, the Dissenters believe, when Bigotry and private Interest abate, which have rais'd and given strength to the Cry, and a serious Concern for Truth shall take place, it will appear to be *as Lawful* and *as Consistent* for a Churchman sometimes to go to a Meeting, and for a Dissenter sometimes to go to Church, as for a Churchman to go sometimes to a Cathedral, and sometimes to a Parish-Church; sometimes to a Church subject to its Ordinary, and sometimes to one that is exempt from Episcopal Jurisdiction. For if the Unlawfulness and Inconsistency of Occasional Conformity and Occasional Nonconformity ly in this, that the different ways of Worship in Parish-Churches and Meetings not being uniform, 'tis a Contradiction sometimes to worship God in one, and sometimes in the other; then 'tis equally unlawful to go sometimes to a Cathedral, and sometimes to a Parish-Church, because the manner of Worship in Parish-Churches and Cathedrals is not uniform neither. Or if it ly in this, that Meetings and Churches not being subject to the same Episcopal Jurisdiction, 'tis denying one Sunday what a man asserts another; then 'tis equally unlawful to go sometimes to a Church subject to Episcopal Jurisdiction, and sometimes to one that's exempt from it, since they are no more subject to the same Episcopal Jurisdiction, than a Church and a Meeting. Or if it ly in this, that the Ministers who officiate in Churches and Meetings, have not both of them Orders from Bishops: neither is that Fact true, for some of the Dissenting Ministers have had Orders from Bishops; nor is the Reason just, because that it is not held lawful to communicate occasionally with those Dissenting Churches, whose Pastors have been Episcopally ordain'd. If it be said that there's a difference between worshipping God sometimes in a Church, and sometimes in a Meeting, and between worshipping him occasionally in a Cathedral and in a Parish Church, in a Church subject to Episcopal Jurisdiction and in a Peculiar; because Cathedrals and Parish-Churches, whether subject to Episcopal Jurisdiction, or exempt from it, are all of 'em establish'd by Law, that is, have certain

certain Privileges granted 'em by the Act of Uniformity. The Dissenters reply, that if that be all the difference, 'twill be still equally lawful to go sometimes to a Church and sometimes to a Meeting, since the Dissenting Meetings have certain Immunitys and Privileges granted 'em by the Act of Toleration.

V. In fine, the Dissenters don't only think Occasional Conformity, and Occasional Nonconformity lawful and consistent, both consider'd in themselves, and compar'd with the practice of those, who raise the great Objections against it; but think it the *likeliest Expedient*, as the Case is at present stated, to root out Party in the State and Bigotry in the Church. For since it opens a door into Employments to several honest Dissenters, and leaves it open to several moderate Churchmen; 'tis to be hop'd, the Government having a Liberty to employ 'em, will not prefer merely a Churchman, but an honest Man that is fit for the Post, be he Churchman or Dissenter. And 'tis to be hop'd too, that the common sort, who are often more led by Example than Principle, will conclude, when they see the best Men go both to Church and Meetings, that Religion does not consist in going to either (as 'tis to be fear'd too many at present think) but in Faith in Jesus Christ, and the essential Dutys of Love to God and our Neighbour.

VI. And whatever has made Men inveigh so much of late against Occasional Conformity, as a Practice more prejudicial to the Church than going constantly to a Meeting, or never worshipping God publickly at all; yet it was formerly thought an Expedient that would ruin the Dissenters, and be *highly serviceable to the Church*. Dr. Stillingfleet in the Places quoted before, after he had complain'd of the Dissenters for neglecting Occasional Conformity, and of their Preachers for not pressing it as a Duty, as the Cause of that neglect, and charg'd them to exhort their Hearers to it for the future, as they wou'd act like honest Men; adds, that he does not question but in time, if they find Conformity lawful, they will judge it to be their Duty. A very learned Prelate has observ'd, that this has happen'd so in fact; and that after St. Bartholomew in 62. Occasional Conformity was a step that carry'd many much further; and from Occasional Conformity grew to Constant Conformity, if not in the Persons themselves, yet in their Children. And this is a Fact that Sir H. the great Advo-

Pag. 38.

Proceedings of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, p. 37.

B. p. 9. §. 3. case for an Act to prevent this Practice, shows great Zeal and Industry: tho' 'tis no great Objection against the Bill to so great a Churchman as Sir H. for him to think a meer Nut wall sufficient Answer to, if he could have deny'd the Fact it self. And in wonder Occasional Conformity shou'd have this effect; since, to wave all other Reasons, the generality of Men are for taking things in gross, and accordingly them altogether and at all times good, or altogether bad at all times. And are impatient, if not uncapable, of attending to those Circumstances, which make one Action different from another that's of a like kind, or the same Action in appearance one while and in this respect lawful, and another while and in another respect sinful.

Whether the Dissenters have taken due care to inform themselves of the Points in dispute, and whether they are sincere in their Dissent, must be left to the Judgment of the great Day, when the secrets of all Hearts shall be reveal'd; and whether they are mistaken must be left to every man after serious Consideration to determine. But if the Dissenters are mistaken, these are the Grounds of their Mistakes. And if we believe 'em to be honest men, we must believe, that their Dissent is not more Humor or Stubbornness, as it can't be interest. And I'm sorry that Sir H. M's Charity is at so much a lower ebb than Dr. Stillingfleet's was some years since, as to imagine that it is; and that he entertains so mean an Opinion of their Sense as well as of their Grace, as to think 'em thro Stubbornness to be wanting to their Interest, as well as to their Obligations. I would hope few are of Sir H's mind, and that the Generality think their Dissent rather owing to the Weakness of their Judgment, than the Refractoriness of their Wills: as Sir H. himself does in another place, when he had either more tenderness for the Dissenters, or more caution, and regard to his own Reputation. And if this be the Case of the Dissenters, the Duty of all Men towards 'em, is to use their charitable Endeavours to convince 'em, and to remove these the Grounds of their Mistakes: and which is yet more charitable, to bear with these Mistakes, if such Endeavors shou'd not succeed. For supposing that the Dissenters are in the wrong, and shou'd remain so, yet they think they have an unquestionable Right to be *Tolerated* in com-

B. p. 6. §. 3. *Dr. Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation*, p. 16.

Pref. p. 2. §. 2.

mon

mon with all other peaceable Men, and so far in particular, as their Mistakes can't be either very great or fatal to others, or themselves.

A Toleration is the Exemption of a peaceable Man, who is thought to be mistaken in matters of Religion, from all sorts of Penaltys and Force: And all Mistakes both real and suppos'd are peaceable ones, that are not injurious to our Civil Interests. And by Civil Interests we mean, the enjoyments of Life, Health, Liberty, Riches, Reputation, Relations, *&c.* and their Security from the Injurys of our Fellow-Citizens, and from a Foreign Power. The Penaltys and Force which a Toleration exempts peaceable mistaken Men from, signify the depriving a Man of any Privilege, or the inflicting of any corporal or pecuniary Punishment, or note of Disgrace. So that the Toleration a Protestant Dissenter lays claim to, is *an Exemption of him from any harm, from which the Law protects every innocent Englishman, and a securing him in those Rights, which innocent Men enjoy.* A Toleration is no Toleration that is not absolute and impartial: And they who restrain a Toleration to some sort of peaceable Dissenters, and exempt them only from some sorts and degrees of Penaltys, instead of tolerating, persecute all other peaceable Dissenters, and so far as it leaves any Dissenter obnoxious to any Penalty, even those whom they pretend to tolerate too. But the Toleration we speak of, signifys the Exemption of all peaceable Dissenters; and an Exemption of them from the Loss of any Privilege, and the infliction of the least Hardship.

And in this I think I have the good Fortune to find Sir H. *agreeing with me* in some places of his Book and Preface; particularly where he describes a Toleration of Dissenters to be B.p.3. §.3.
'A Liberty given 'em to follow their respective Trades, and 'to enjoy their Libertys and Propertys, without being di-'sturb'd by Prosecutions for Conscience-sake only. And a little before, where he seems to describe the State of Persecution of Dissenters by 'their liableness to Penaltys'; and their §. 2.
Toleration by 'an Exemption from all Temporal Punishment. And we may learn what Sir H. means by the temporal Punishments and Penaltys, which a Toleration exempts Dissenters from, and what Libertys and Propertys it secures the enjoyment of, by seeing what he grounds a Toleration upon, and

for

Pref. p. 1. §. 9. for what end 'tis design'd. 'Tis grounded upon 'the Freedom 'of Man's Mind, and the Inefficacy of every thing to prevail 'upon it, but what is introduc'd by Love and Kindness; and 'upon the suitableness of gentle Methods to attain this End. And what are these gentle Methods? why according to Sir H. they are three: 1. 'Reasons, 2. Arguments' (which Sir H. is pleas'd to make two) 'and, 3. a good Example.' Therefore Sir H. undoubtedly by Penaltys and Temporal Punishments, means all Penaltys and Temporal Punishments; and by Security of Liberty and Property, means a Security of all Libertys and Propertys. For there's no Penalty nor Temporal Punishment of any kind whatsoever, nor the loss of any Liberty or Property whatsoever, that can be thought to be 'Love 'and Kindness, or gentle Methods, or Reasons, or Arguments, 'or a good Example. So that Sir H. in these Places, where he talks more professedly about a Toleration than in any other, by a Toleration means the security of all the Libertys and Propertys of a Dissenter, and the exemption of him from all sorts and degrees of Punishments whatsoever.

Nay to shew how *large* Sir H's general Notions of a Toleration are, and the particular Application of these Notions to his own case, he supposes this general Principle, that all Degrees of Reproach, even those that deserve no severer a Name than indecent Reflections upon a Man for his sincere and humble Opinion, are Persecution for Conscience-sake. For having said, 'That if any Person, instead of bringing Pref. p. 2. §. ult. 'Reasons and Arguments, shall run out into indecent Reflec- 'tions on the Writer, he shall desire him to apply on this 'Occasion a short Saying,

'Didicit ille maledicere, ego contemnere:'

He adds, 'That he may be confident (I suppose 'tis upon the just Awe he presumes every one will have of falling under the insupportable Burden of his Contempt) 'that 'no Persons will deny him the same Indulgence, which they 'are so ready to grant to every one else, and that there- 'fore he shall never be persecuted for Conscience-sake only.

I know there is scarce any Part of the rest of Sir H's Book but may be brought to shew, that Sir H's Notions of a Toleration are not so large as these. But tho I can't answer them, possibly Sir H. at his leisure may; and shew us how these

Pas-

Passages, which I have quoted, *agree* with a thousand others, and with the whole design of his 'sincere' Treatise. But since we have so full a proof, that this is Sir H's notion of a Toleration, in those places where he lays down the general notion of a Toleration, and the particular notion of that, according to which he desires to be dealt with himself; I hope till Sir H. shall recant these Passages, which are so full and positive to our purpose, he will forgive my Vanity (who am so proud to be of his Mind) in asserting that the Notion of a Toleration, which he lays down in several Places of his Book, agrees with mine: And I hope he'l forgive my Freedom, in desiring him to take the trouble at his leisure to shew how he agrees with himself.

I. Having thus explain'd the meaning of a Toleration by the help of some Passages in Sir H's Treatise, we'l consider what the Dissenters advance to prove it a Right which belongs to all Mankind, and particularly to themselves. To prove that a Toleration is the indefeasible Right of all peaceable Dissenters, they alledg, that no man can help believing what he thinks is true, and every Man is bound to worship God in that way, which he thinks the best; and that no man shou'd be punish'd for *that which he can't, or which he ought not to help.* And I suppose this is what Sir H. means, when he tells us, 'that nothing can be more free than the Mind of 'Man, and that nothing can prevail upon it, but what is 'introduc'd by Love and Kindness: upon which account 'he says, he has been always for a Toleration. Pref. p. 1 §. 9.

II. But if it were in a Man's power to believe what he wou'd, which is as great an absurdity as can be suppos'd, yet wou'd he have a Right to be tolerated. Because no Man has *any Authority*, either to oblige another by a Law to believe any speculative Article, or to approve of any particular Mode of Worship, or else to undergo a Penalty. The Magistrate has no such Authority, because his Province extends no farther than the Lives, Libertys and Propertys of Mankind in general, and of his Subjects in particular; but can't reach to any points of Faith and Worship: which as they are not the Ends of Civil Society, can't be the matter of the enacting part of any Law. Nor has the Church any such Authority, since her Authority extends not to Mens Lives, Libertys,

and

and Propertys, which must be affected by the Penaltys of a Law. Nor have they both together such an Authority; For the Church has no Authority to make any such Article, since she has no Legislative Authority, and is restrain'd barely to the Execution of those Laws our Lord has left us, and to the Execution of them only over her own Members. Or if the Church had such an Authority, the Magistrate cou'd have none to give those Articles a Sanction, by affixing a Penalty to them; which must affect Mens Lives, Libertys or Propertys, for the sake of Points of Faith and Worship.

III. But that no such Authority is lodg'd any where, is further evident, Because the End for which such an Authority cou'd be suppos'd to be lodg'd in any hands, is not to be attain'd by that Authority's being exerted. The only end for which such an Authority cou'd be suppos'd to be lodg'd any where, wou'd be to convince a Man, that such a speculative Article was true, or that such a Mode of Worship was the best. For to say that such a Power is lodg'd any where to make Men profess to believe or approve what they are not convinc'd is true or good, is only to say, that there is a Power lodg'd somewhere to make Men Knaves; which I suppose will not be pretended. And it can't be pretended with any better reason, that such a Power is lodg'd any where to convince men of the Truth of any Proposition, or of the propriety of any Mode of Worship. For Penaltys, which are the Sanction of Laws, and the only way by which such an Authority cou'd be exerted were it lodg'd in any hands whatsoever for this end, are wholly *ineffectual to convince* the Mind, that that Article of Faith is true, or that that manner of Worship is the best, which they are design'd to enforce. Penaltys can only restrain and deter Men; but they are wholly improper and ineffectual to perswade or convince. 'Tis only a Connexion between Ideas, and the Evidence of that Connexion, which can convince. But where's the Connexion between the Truth of a Proposition, and the Penalty a Man must undergo, who does not believe it? Is it a consequence, for example, that such a Proposition is true, because I must lose my Estate, if I believe it to be false? And the Evidence of a Penalty is just such an Idea, as that of the Light of a Cat-of-nine-tails, the Colour of a Smell, or the Sound of Scarlet.

IV. And

IV. And if it could be thought, that an Authority to enforce Articles of Faith and Worship were lodg'd any where, and that Force was a proper means to convince the Mind, yet would not such an Authority be *useful to Mankind.* For it cou'd not serve to propagate the Truth, because tho the Men in whom such an Authority was lodg'd, might by the virtue of such an Authority propagate their own Opinion, yet unless they were infallible, they cou'd not be secure of propagating the Truth. Nay, such a Power vested in the Magistrate or in the Church, must necessarily hinder the Propagation of Truth instead of promoting it; since there are infinitely more Magistrates and Churches in the Wrong than in the Right. The glorious French Example of Henry the Third, which Sir H. (to his Honor be it remember'd, with the other French Precedents he follow'd in his Address to K. James) proposes as a Pattern of promoting Truth for her Majesty to follow, cou'd have only promoted the worst of Errors, the Infallibility of Popish Tenets, and a Right to persecute all that don't hold 'em. Sure the way to propagate Truth and Error can't be the same; nor can Truth ever be maintain'd by means, that will equally serve to establish Falshood. The way by which Christianity at first spread it self, and upon which the Reformation is founded, is, that every Man shou'd judg freely of Truth for himself, and that no Man shou'd judg of it for another. And one wou'd think this had been a Precedent more proper for Sir H. to have propos'd to her Majesty, than a Practice that's the greatest Support of Slavery and a false Religion. And till this Principle shall obtain more universally, we must not wonder that so few Nations in the World, and so very few in those Nations, are either Votarys to Truth themselves, or deserve the glorious Character of being its Witnesses to others. Ded. p. 3. §. 4.

V. For these Reasons the Protestant Dissenters think all peaceable Nonconformists should be exempted from all Penaltys, notwithstanding their Dissent from any Articles, tho they were essential to Christian Faith or Worship. But they think they have a peculiar Right to be tolerated in their peaceable Dissent from things, that are allow'd by the Compellers themselves to be either *faulty or unnecessary.* If any Man had a Right to enforce Points of Faith and Worship, and Force were

proper to convince, and to propagate the true Faith and Worship, yet wou'd there be no reason to use it to enforce things own'd to be perfectly indifferent. The Advantage of the Society being the end and measure of Lawgiving, Indifferent things ought not to be the matter of Laws. And Laws being the direction of a Man for his good, to direct him to use things indifferent, is, as if a Physician instead of prescribing good Drugs, shou'd order his Patient a chip in Porridg. Laws are to restrain Men from hurtful Actions: But to restrain 'em from those which are innocent, and will do 'em no harm, is like a sour Physician, to confine his Patient unnecessarily to his Bed, or to ty him up to one certain sort of Diet, whereby he renders himself intolerable to the Patient, and the rest of his wholesom Rules less regarded, and more uneasy than otherwise they wou'd be.

The Maxim, that Magistrates have an undoubted Right to command 'Omnia licita & honesta,' which has been so industriously instil'd into the Minds of Magistrates and People of late, has done more mischief than one cou'd easily imagine. And if this was to be the measure of the Magistrates Authority, his Laws might soon come to be no wiser than the Decrees, that were made by the Senate of Women in the Reign of Heliogabalus: Enjoining a thousand Impertinencys relating to Dress, Place, Carriage, Visits, Ceremonys, Salutations, and a multitude of other inconvenient Formalitys. Or as those which were made by that prudent Emperor himself (the Uneasiness of whose Reign to his Subjects proceeded as much from Humor as Vice) who at one time order'd all the Cobwebs of Rome to be collected, that he might judg of its Magnitude; and at another, a thousand Mice, Rats, Wheasels and Polecats, in order to exhibit them in a publick Shew to the People, for some deep Policy like the former. And yet those who propagate this Doctrine must own that these Laws enjoin'd nothing but 'licita & honesta.' The Jewish Laws did not only enjoin 'licita & honesta,' but things necessary to that Dispensation. And yet that Oeconomy is call'd an intolerable Yoke by St. Peter, because there were such a number of Injunctions, which were only necessary upon some certain Suppositions. If Magistrates shou'd exert this Authority in the Church, which the Priests are so desirous to give 'em,

'em, a Complaint of a celebrated Father against the Church in his time, for the multiplicity of its Ceremonys, wou'd be very applicable to ours, 'and the condition of the Jews wou'd 'be more tolerable than of the Christians. And if the Advocates for this Principle did but once feel the full weight of it, they wou'd quickly change it for a better, and substitute this in the room of it, that Magistrates have an undoubted Right to command 'Omnia justa & utilia. D. Aug. in 2 Ep. ad Januar.

I. Thus far we have the Honor to agree with Sir H. M. in his stating the bounds of a Toleration, and in some of his Reasons for giving it so large a Compass. It may serve to clear this Matter better, if we consider how far He is consistent with himself and us, in his other Notions and *in his Practice*. And to begin with the last, I wou'd humbly desire him to consider with himself, how far he has been from tolerating the Dissenters in the same manner he desires to be tolerated. For notwithstanding all his pretensions to Temper and Tenderness, he tells 'em, 'That they have set up an arbitrary 'Dispensing Power in their own Consciences, whereby they 'are enabled to go to Church for their Profit and to a Con-'venticle for their Principles.' That is in short, that they are a pack of Hypocritical Knaves, who pretend to Conscience, and pursue nothing but their Advantage. And agreeably to this gentle Method of treating 'em, he tells em, 'That they 'are unfit to be trusted as Executors or Guardians.' If he had laid this down as his private Opinion, however indecent it might be for him to make such an Assertion, I dare say the Dissenters wou'd not have plac'd it in the History of their Persecutions, but might possibly have slighted it as much, as he says he shall the Reflections of his Antagonists. Sir H. possibly might be aware of this, and therefore that they might not escape so easily, by laying it down as a Fact, that they are not trusted with such Charges by the generality of Dissenters, he gives an accent to the Reflection, and delivers it as the Opinion of a Body of Men, who know 'em the best, and it seems according to him, trust 'em the less for it. What else cou'd provoke him to say a thing so void of all Truth, and without the least Foundation? 'That the Dissenters have generally 'more Wisdom than to entrust those sort of Occasional Con-'formists to be Guardians of their Children, or Executors B. p. 2. §. 2. Pref. p. 2. §. 3. Pref. p. 2. §. 2.

'of their Wills. Unless it be for the sake of the Quaintness and Chime of what follows; Who yet, says he, 'desire to be 'entrusted by the Government with the Guardianship and 'Execution of the Laws of their Country. And possibly this is not the only Instance, where a fancy'd elegancy of Expression may have led Sir H. into a mistake, both when he acts the Historian and the Disputant.

But I find, how large soever Sir H's Notions of a Toleration in general are, and how much larger he desires the bounds of his own in particular to be, yet the Dissenters are not the only Men 'that have set up an arbitrary dispensing Power in 'their Consciences'; For he can break thro those Bounds at any time to get at an Occasional Conformist, or to make a beautiful Period. An indecent Expression against Sir H. is Persecution; But Sir H. it seems has a liberty to rob Men of their good Name, and expose 'em for acting from a Principle of Conscience, as Persons not fit to be trusted in the common concerns of Life and Friendship. And all this is yet to consist with tenderness too. But this is not only to take away 'the Guardian-'ship and Execution of the Laws' from honest Men, but as far as 'in Him lys 'the liberty of following their respective Trades', which He himself makes one Instance of a Toleration. E.p.3.§.4. too. since he that's not fit to be trusted as an Executor, is as unfit to be dealt with as a Merchant. These are some of Sir H's 'Tenderness for the Dissenters, some of his gentle Methods, of 'his Reasons, Arguments, and good Examples design'd for the Conviction of Occasional Conformists.

II. Since it thus appears how little his Practice agrees with his own Rules, we must not wonder if we find his Conclusions sometimes contradict his Principles. The Inconsistency of some of his Assertions with his Notions of a Toleration, which seem to be the same with ours, may be consider'd as Exceptions to the Principles we have laid down concerning it; and may for order sake be digested under the following Heads.

1. That tho a Toleration ought to be given to a constant Dissenter, it ought not to be given to an Occasional Conformist. 2. That to incapacitate an Occasional Conformist for all Places and Employments, is not inconsistent with a Toleration. 3. That Penaltys are not improper means to Conviction. 4. Or at least to dispose Mens Minds for Conviction.

5. That

5. That the Dissenters are not capable of Employments by the Act of Toleration. Or 6. That if they are capable by that Law or any other, they shou'd not be suffer'd to remain so.

1. Sir H. thinks in the first place, that tho a Toleration ought to be continu'd to a constant, whom he's pleas'd to call a conscientious Dissenter, *yet no Toleration ought to be given to the Occasional Conformist*; whom he opposes to a Conscientious Dissenter. But why should not the Dissenter that occasionally conforms, have the benefit of a Toleration as well as he who never does? Is not an Occasional Conformist a Dissenter? And is not his Mind as free as any others? Is not every thing that is not introduc'd with Love and Kindness as unlikely, and are not gentle Methods, Reasons, Arguments and a good Example as likely to convince the former as the latter? Can any Penalty be consistent with the Toleration of this Man, which is inconsistent with the Toleration of that? Or to examin this Position by our Arguments for a Toleration, as well as by Sir H's Notions of one: Must every Dissenter be exempt from Punishment, because he can't help believing as he does, and should not act otherwise than he thinks he ought; and must an Occasional Conformist be punish'd, because he believes both the Church of England and the Dissenting Churches to be good and lawful and because he thinks he ought in conscience to communicate sometimes with the one, and sometimes with the other? If no Man has a Right to punish any Dissenter, can any one have an Authority to punish an Occasional Conformist? Or if Punishment can't alter any man's Opinion, why should it be apply'd to bring over him? Or why is the true side of the Question about Occasional Conformity, likelier to be serv'd by Penaltys than the Truth of other Propositions? Nay, since there's less difference between an Occasional Conformist and a Churchman, than between other Dissenters and a Churchman; tho other Dissenters were to be punish'd, why should he? Let any man shew me any difference, why these Arguments, by which Sir H. and we have prov'd the Right which Dissenters have to a Toleration, don't hold equally just in the Case of the Occasional Conformist, as well as in that of the constant Dissenter. B.p.5. §.6.

Sir H. it seems thinks they don't, because the Occasional Conformist does not dissent out of Conscience of the Unlawfulness

ness to conform. For according to His way of reasoning, he that conforms sometimes, shews that he thinks the Terms of Church-Communion are not sinful, and therefore his Separation he says is wilful. Now a Toleration being only due to tender Consciences, and not to our stubborn and corrupt Wills, Sir H. thinks the Occasional Conformist is not entitled to a Toleration, tho the Dissenter is. I take this to be Sir H's meaning, when he answers this Objection, 'How the Commons 'who think going to a Meeting to be a Crime in an Occasional 'Conformist, can think that a Toleration ought to be continued long'? thus: 'That there are no Premises to warrant 'such a severe Conclusion upon them. For says he, What 'prodigious steps must be made to come at it? How many 'plain and obvious distinctions must be laid aside to compass 'this Argument? Is there no difference, continues he, to be 'made between a Wilful and Unwilling Separation from the 'National Church? Between Occasional Conformity for an 'Office, and for private Information? Between doing that 'which is, and that which is not consistent with the publick 'Safety? For does it follow that in case the Commons 'should think it a DETESTABLE CRIME in those, 'that can and will not conform, that therefore they must 'of necessity entertain the same thoughts of those, that would 'conform and cannot? Is there no difference to be made between an Occasional Conformist for an Office, and a Conscientious Dissenter? And this Distinction between a Conscientious Dissenter, or a Dissenter that is not yet convinc'd, and an Occasional Conformist, is to be met with in many other places; charitably to insinuate, and instil into mens Minds, that the Dissenter who conforms upon Occasion, is so far from acting according to his Conscience, as to act against it. So that upon the whole Sir H's Reasons why the Occasional Conformist is not to be tolerated, amount to these: 1. Because none but a conscientious Dissenter should be tolerated. 2. Because an Occasional Conformist is no Conscientious Dissenter.

B.p.2. §.7.

B.p.6.§.6.

Ded. p. 2. §. 2. p. 4.

B.p.7. §.1.

Pref. p. 2. §. 2.

But in the first place, to make a *Conscientious Dissenter the only Subject* of a Toleration, is subverting all Toleration; and instead of proving it every Dissenter's Right, renders it defeasible and precarious. A Conscientious Dissenter is the Dissenter that acts according to his Conscience. Now if the Magistrate

tolerates

tolerates none but them, whom he thinks to act according to their Conscience, it may happen, that he may tolerate none at all: For some men have thought all Dissenters ill men, and to act against their Conscience; and a great many have thought both Dissenting from the Church, and the neglect of Occasional Conformity as great an Absurdity in it self, and as great a Contradiction to the Dissenting Principles, as any one pretends Occasional Conformity to be now. And Sir H. gives us reason to suspect, that he does not think more favourably of any of the Dissenters than of the Occasional Conformists. For he seems to suppose, that 'tis 'their stubborn and corrupt Wills 'that make 'em dissent, and put 'em under an Incapacity to serve 'their Prince and Country'. Supposing then Sir H. to be sole Magistrate, neither Occasional Conformists nor constant Dissenters must be tolerated. But it is not only cramping a Toleration, but rendering it impracticable, to make it extend only to Conscientious Dissenters; since no Magistrate can tell who is Conscientious, and who is not. B.p.6.§.2.

But how does it appear in the second place, that *an Occasional Conformist is no Conscientious Dissenter?* Both the Friends and the Enemys of the Dissenters tell [redacted]hat Occasional Conformity is against the Interest of Dissenters, and the Occasional Conformists declare to the World they act by no other Principle, than the Dictates of their Conscience, both when they statedly Dissent, and when they occasionally Conform. If Sir H. won't believe them, who must be Judg? Sir H.? How comes he by an Authority to judg his Brother? Is he not setting up an Inquisition then to try and punish Hypocrites, which he pretends so much to abhor, and which he thinks the Dissenters have so little reason to suspect? But Sir H. says, 'tis plain he does not act conscientiously: 'For Conforming and Non-conforming 'are Contradictions, and nothing but a firm Persuasion that the 'Terms of Communion (he should have said constant Communion) in the Church of England are Lawful can justify the one; 'and that condemns the other. We have examin'd before what the Occasional Conformist alledges, to prove his Practice to be no Contradiction. But supposing it were a Contradiction, whom does it prove to be no Conscientious Man? Why him that continues in this Practice, and thinks it a Contradiction; but not him that continues in it, and thinks it no Contradiction, as we shall B.p.9.§.1. B.p.6.§.7. P. 31, 32.

shew.

shew more fully by and by. If therefore Sir H. who thinks Occasional Conformity a Contradiction, should conform Occasionally, he wou'd be no Conscientious Man. But there wou'd be no reason to think that Dissenter a dishonest Man, who shou'd continue the Practice tho it were a Contradiction; if he did not see it to be one. For that which is an hypocritical Practice in the man who is convinc'd of the Contradiction, is but a mistaken one in him that is not.

And 'tis happy for Sir H. in my mind, that Consciousness of the Contradiction must go to make a Practice or a Principle Hypocritical; or else I don't know how He could be excus'd from the same Hypocrisy he charges upon the Occasional Conformists. For we shall find an Instance presently, where one of his Conclusions contradicts its own Premises. But I have the same Charity for Him that I hope he'l have for the Dissenters for the time to come; and wou'd believe he no more saw that Contradiction, tho it lys exceeding obvious, than I would have Him think the Occasional Conformists see the Contradiction of their Practice, if there be any Contradiction in it: Especially since if there be any, it does not so immediately occur to the Mind. So that I hope Sir H. for his own sake will conclude, that tho every man may judg of the Consistency and Contradiction of the Principles of Occasional Conformists; yet no Man can determine whether he be a Conscientious Man or a Hypocrite who holds 'em.

2. But if Sir H. should be beaten out of this Redoubt, he has another to retreat to. If it should appear, that an Occasional Conformist has as good a Title to a Toleration as a constant Dissenter, then Sir H. says, what he would have done to this Occasional Conformist, is *not inconsistent with a Toleration*; because 'twould be *no Penalty* upon him at all. What is it Sir H. would have done with him? Why he would have him incapacitated to hold any Place or Imployment: and seems to express it by allowing him a Toleration in his private, 'but not in his B. p. 4. §. 2. 'publick Capacity'. So that by Sir H's own Confession, it is but half a Toleration he would allow an Occasional Conformist. But notwithstanding this, he calls it 'Moderation,' and says P. 3. §. 5. 'tis a Method purely defensive of the Church, without the 'least Encroachment on any one's Rights or Privileges what-'soever. And in another place he appeals to the World, §. 2. 'what

'what there is in this Incapacity inconsistent with the Act of
'Toleration?' And in another, positively affirms, 'it does
'not affect the Liberty of Conscience of any Occasional Con-
'formist.' But we need do no more to prove that depriving the Dissenters of all Places and Employments they hold at present, and taking away the Capacity of ever holding any for the future, is a Penalty and a severe one, than to consider, that 'tis putting a Mark of Infamy and Disgrace upon all Dissenters; that 'tis divesting them not only of a Capacity, which they enjoy by Law at present, as they do the Capacity of taking by Will or Deed of Gift: but a Capacity of an infinitely higher Nature and Advantage to a Man of a publick Spirit, and who has so just a Taste of things, as to esteem Usefulness one of the most refin'd Pleasures, and highest ends of Life. 'Tis burying every Occasional Conformist alive, and preventing him from serving his Queen and Country. 'Tis dispossessing some of 'em of Places of high Trust and Honor, which they enjoy by the Favor of their Prince, or of the People: Others of 'em of Employments in the nature of Freeholds, which they have purchas'd, and which are bought and sold as other Freeholds are: And others, to mention no more, of Places, by which they and their Familys intirely subsist.

A Toleration, according to Sir H. M. 'is a Freedom of Dis-
'senters from Reproach, Penaltys, and Prosecutions for Con-
'science sake; and an Enjoyment of Liberty and Property
'notwithstanding their different way of worshipping God.'
This we have shewn to be Sir H's Notion of a Toleration before. Let us examine then whether this Deprivation and Incapacity be not as inconsistent with *these Notions of* Sir H. as with those, which we take to be the true. And I will leave it to himself whether they are not. For since he thinks he can be persecuted 'by
'an indecent Expression,' must not a Dissenter think himself persecuted, when he's thus as it were pillory'd, and expos'd as a Villain not fit to be trusted? When a Dissenter is depriv'd of a Freehold which he has bought, can he be said to 'enjoy his
'Property'? Or when he has no course left him, but never to go to a Meeting, or to starve (which would be the case of many Dissenters, if they were excluded from all Offices) will he retain the 'Liberty of his Conscience? Are such Methods as B.p.3. §.2.
'these no Severitys? No Temporal Punishments'? Punish-

B.p.7. §.2. P.5. §.3. ments they are according to Sir H's Notion of Punishments, and his own Confession: And God be prais'd, since Sir H. does not seem quite out of hopes of inflicting 'em, they are not Eternal. And if his Expectation should be answer'd, and a Law should pass, threatning the Dissenters with such Severitys, will Sir H. pass his word that there shall be 'no Prosecutions' commenc'd upon 'em?

Upon the whole then, how *unjustly* is it asserted, that a Bill that would have rob'd the Dissenters of so many just Rights, B.p.3. §.4. and laid 'em under so many Hardships, 'would not have 'encroach'd in the least on any Dissenter's Privilege, nor have 'affected the Liberty of any Occasional Conformist's Conscience: B.p.3. §.5. 'and that a Dissenter that is contending against it, contends 'for nothing but Power and Dominion'? Whereas 'tis a Toleration of the Conscience of all Protestant Dissenters, and particularly of the Conscience of an Occasional Conformist, and the Principles upon which all Toleration depends both in Fact and Reason, that he's contending *for*, when he oppose this Bill. ''Tis to defend himself from a real Persecution,' B. p. 11. §. 4. and that none of the mildest neither. And this is 'both the 'Dispute, that I may use Sir H's words, and the End why the 'Dissenters are so much incited to oppose this Bill: and this is 'the Reason, why they not only imagine,' but are certain, 'that the same is design'd to bring a real Hardship upon 'em 'for Conscience sake.' But supposing they were not wholly acting the Christian, and preventing a Persecution, which often proves a Temptation as well as a Hardship to honest Men; and were only pleading for their Rights as Englishmen, are they to blame? Why then does Sir H. upon B.p.4. §.1. this occasion ask the Dissenters, 'whether there is no hopes 'of going to a better World without a publick Employ-'ment'? A Question that, as it stands here, would have been a more proper one for a Julian to have made to a Christian, or for Lewis the 14th to his Hugonots, than for one Protestant to put to another. But however, tho there's no Occasional Conformist makes any doubt of it, or whether a man mayn't get thither without an Estate too; yet if he can't have his Passage to Heaven thro this World so free and easy without his Employment or his Estate, as with 'em, mayn't he do what he can to defend or regain 'em? But I'm sure if the

Dissen-

Dissenters be of the opinion, that they could not get to Heaven without an Employment, they would have very good reason to think Sir H. and his Party did not differ from them, since they take so much pains to ingross them all to themselves.

3. But to what end are the Dissenters to have no Places, and some others to have 'em all? Will the incapacitating Dissenters to hold any Place or Employment, convince them, and bring 'em over to the Church? Are Deprivations and Incapacitys any of Sir H's three gentle Methods, which are proper to attain that end? One would have thought that they could neither 'introduce the Excellency of the Establish'd Church into the 'Minds of Dissenters by Love and Kindness, nor be either Reasons, Arguments, or a good Example.' He seems to be aware of this, and therefore that he might leave room for his Reader to think that these Penaltys might compass this End, notwithstanding any thing he had said of the inefficacy of every thing but Love and Kindness, and the efficacy of gentle Methods to convince mens Minds, he no where in terms denys, that Penaltys are improper means to that end, or that Reasons, Arguments and a good Example are the only proper means to attain it: But drops a word, which if it have any meaning, is to give us to understand, that some *Penaltys are 'proper' to convince* the Dissenters. 'Tis true, He lays it down, 'that 'nothing can be more free than the Mind of Man, and that no 'thing can prevail upon it, but what is introduc'd with Love 'and Kindness.' And indeed any would imagine, that the Conclusion drawn from these Principles would have been, that since Penaltys are neither Love nor Kindness, they were wholly improper to prevail upon the Mind: And that is the Conclusion that necessarily follows from them. But his Conclusion is altogether as arbitrary and free as he owns our Minds to be, and amounts to no more than this, that gentle Methods are 'more' (instead of the only) proper, and 'more' (instead of the only) likely means to bring the Dissenters over to the Church, than Penaltys and Punishments. He might e'en as well have concluded, if he had pleas'd, that therefore Penaltys and Punishments were the likeliest means to do it, and by as good a Deduction from his Premises. Methinks 'tis very hard He should have any thoughts at all of punishing the Dissenters for differing from the Principles of other Folks, who is not to be precluded by the

Pref. p. 2. §. 1.

Ibid.

Ibid.

necessity of the closest Connexion from differing from his own. For tho it should be at the expence of ever so many Consequences and Illations from his own Maxims, He will not suffer himself to be debar'd the Liberty of Persecution. And it must be allow'd that He has been singularly cautious, lest he should have precluded himself from beginning one, when he shall see good: Which if we attend to his Inference, and not to that which is the natural one, he has left room enough to commence to morrow, if he thinks fit. For tho what is introduc'd by Love and Kindness is the most proper (so 'tis in his Conclusion, but the only proper in his Premises) Method to prevail, yet have a care Gentlemen! If you stand out, and thereby convince Sir H. that gentle Methods are not the most proper to bring you into the Church, He has another course in reserve. If you won't lead, which were indeed to be wish'd, He don't say you shan't be driven. But tho the Force of Sir H's own Principles han't been able to convince him of the injustice, impertinence and absurdity of Persecution, because in all likelihood he wrote in so much haste, as not to take time to consider whither they tended; yet 'tis to be hop'd, when he shall seriously reflect at his leisure, how far Truth and his own Principles would have led him, if he had given up himself to their Conduct; he will see that he has stopt short, and will, I hope, immediately submit to be led to the utmost length, that the Principles of an absolute Toleration will carry him.

4. Whether the Truth or Sir H's Principles did not give him some little check when he was writing this, I can't pretend to say: But he has been as cautious as if they had; having only dropt one word [more], which might rather leave a Reserve and an Outlet to himself, than give a hint to his Reader. But He has another good end to serve by Penaltys, besides convincing the Dissenters, of which he seems a little freer. And therefore having but barely insinuated their Aptitude to convince the Minds of Men, which he had own'd were free, he insists more upon it, that *they are proper and effectual to dispose the Mind for Conviction.* Which if they be, Sir H. seems to think that tho this Incapacity, which was design'd to be brought upon the Dissenters, consider'd as a Penalty, shou'd be improper to convince 'em, yet it ought to be brought upon 'em, to dispose 'em

to be convinc'd. For he says, after all that he has said of the Freedom of Man's Mind, and that nothing can prevail upon it, but what is introduc'd with Love and Kindness; and that the gentle Methods of Reasons, Arguments, and a good Example, are much more proper and likely means to bring the Dissenters over to the Church, than Penaltys and Punishments, 'yet he 'cannot conceive that these means will be render'd less effectu- 'al (that's Sir H's modest way of expressing it, but he must mean that they will be render'd more effectual, if he's consistent with himself) 'by the Influence and Assistance of such a 'Bill'. And this is the Advantage, which I suppose Sir H. tells the Queen, 'the Members of the Church of England will find 'by these gentle Methods. Pref. p. 1. §. 9. Pref. p. 2. §. 1. Ded. p. 4.

If Deprivations and Incapacitys won'd dispose the Dissenters to be convinc'd, and were proper for that end, then all the Penal Laws are much more so, and ought to stand in full force against them. For if Hardships are proper to dispose men to be convinc'd, the greater they are, the more likely are they to be effectual. And I suppose they are to be continu'd, till 'tis judg'd that the Dissenters Minds are in a right Disposition: And then Sir H's Scheme will be this. The Dissenters are to be tolerated that they may be convinc'd, and persecuted that they may be dispos'd for Conviction. But Persecution being to precede, the Dissenters won't have much to thank Him for; since for a good reason (which we shall give presently) their Toleration according to this Scheme is hardly ever like to follow.

But if Hardships and Inconveniences were the only thing necessary to dispose the Dissenters for Conviction; or if nothing more was needful than to incline Men 'by Interest to make a more 'favorable Enquiry into the Nature of the Church,' in order to bring 'em into it; Cashiering them of their Places wou'd not be necessary to this end. For the Dissenters find so many Disadvantages by their Separation, and have so many agreeable Prospects in a Return, that they don't want Temptations to conform, either of the one sort or of the other. Their Distance from the Church has nothing attending it but Reproach and Difficulty, besides the satisfaction of their own Minds. They are precluded in a manner from Usefulness, Honor, and Preferment; and have little left 'em, but what Sir H. is not unwilling B. p. 9. §. 1.

B.p.3.§.3. willing to allow 'em, 'the Liberty of being Mechanicks.' If these Hardships are not thought sufficient to make the Dissenters wish for a Reconciliation, and it shall be deem'd necessary to that end to lay 'em under greater, Sir H. may, for ought I know, by the same reason think Confiscation, Banishment, and a Dungeon at last, the proper means to attain it.

But how does Sir H. propose that this Incapacity shall dispose the Dissenters to be convinc'd? Why thus: By making 'em Pref.p.2. §.1. '1. to wish a Reconciliation with the Church, and 2. to enquire 'into its Nature and Excellency.' An *admirable Method* truly of disposing Mens Minds to be convinc'd. Their Hopes of worldly Advantage, and their Fears of Reproach and Shame, with a thousand other Passions, must be rais'd to a good height; and then, just at the nick of time, when they are at a certain pitch, the Men are to enquire that they may be convinc'd. That is to say, a Dissenter must be brib'd and intimidated, in order to make him judg aright concerning the Excellency of the Establish'd Church. One would think Sir H. had no great Opinion of its Excellency, when he places all the likelihood of Conviction upon that, which the wise Man tells us, blinds the Eyes. And I confess I can't but suspect, that Sir H. is not that Churchman at the bottom, nor his Zeal for the Church so happily founded, upon a just enquiry into its Nature, and a Conviction of its Excellency, as he perhaps fancys, and tells the World it is: Since he's afraid that the Occasional Conformity of Officers to the Church of England, that is to say, their frequenting of other Religious Assemblys, is as likely a means to ruin the Church of England, as the Occasional Conformity of Papists (that is to say, the Papists frequenting the Church of England) was a means to ruin Popery at the beginning of the Reformation. Which is, as if Sir H. had said, that the Dissenting Assemblys have as much more Excellency than the Establish'd Church, as the Church of England had at that time above that of Rome: And that the Church of England stands in need of the same Methods to support her against the Dissenters, and has just the same Dangers to fear from them, which the Church of Rome had from the Reformation. Are you sure, Sir H. to accommodate your own words, with some small variation, to our present purpose upon a like Occasion; 'That there 'is no lurking Papist, no French Politician behind the Curtain,

Pref.p.2. §.1, 2.

B.p.9.§.5. p.10.§.2.

B. p. 11. §. 2.

'striving

'striving for Popery and Arbitrary Power, under the specious 'pretences of gaining Proselytes to the Church,' from whom you have taken this Method of a Popish and a false Church, but not of a Protestant and a true one? For Truth can be prejudic'd by nothing so much as Passion, nor Falshood be so effectually supported by any thing else.

But after all, if 'tis proper to make Men wish a thing to be true, in order to convince 'em that it is so; and that Dissenters want the Invitations of Advantages to make 'em Churchmen; why, since Sir H. does not deny but Occasional Conformity is of service to the Church, why, I say, is he against the Dissenters having those *Advantages* by it that they now have, in order to convince 'em of its Lawfulness and Expediency? and why does he think, upon his Principles, that Occasional Conformity will be as much practis'd after 'tis no Inlet into Places, as now it is? For if Sir H. thinks that Occasional Conformity will continue alive without any thing but Principles to support it, and yet thinks the Church in danger without giving her greater Advantages than those she has; either he must think, that the Principles of Occasional Conformity are better than those of Constant Conformity, and so need the foreign Support of Advantage less, or else that the Occasional Conformists are better Men than the Churchmen, and will do that from their Principles, which the Churchmen without concomitant Advantages won't do from theirs. B.p.9. §.3.

But if notwithstanding the Inconsistency of this Opinion with the nature of the thing, and another of Sir H's Assertions, he shall think the raising Mens Passions a proper means to make 'em think coolly and enquire; let us see, whether *Enquiring* into the Nature and Excellency of the Church, *be the End* for which Sir H. wou'd have this Method us'd? Putting Men upon an Enquiry is putting 'em upon acting so suitably to a reasonable Nature, and is an End so truly noble, that tho Penaltys are incompetent means to attain it, yet if that did appear to be really the End propos'd, it wou'd be some Alleviation of their fault, who rob any part of Mankind of their just Rights in order to effect it. But unquestionably this is not the End that's aim'd at in these Penaltys, whatever is pretended. For if Incapacitys and Deprivations were only to make Men enquire into the Nature and Excellency of the Establish'd

Church,

Church, they should be prescrib'd to some Churchmen For all Churchmen have not made that Enquiry; and then they ought to be incapacitated for all Offices, to make them enquire into the Excellency of a Church, to which they conform'd only from Education, Custom, Ease or Advantage. And if Men were only to be incapacitated to make 'em enquire into the Nature and Excellency of the Establish'd Church, then as some Churchmen should be incapacitated, so all Dissenters shou'd not. For some Dissenters have enquir'd into it as much as they can already. They assure us they have, and appeal to Heaven for the Truth of it. And Sir H. ought in Charity to believe them: I'm sure 'tis out of his Province to judg whether they have or no. That must be left to Almighty God, who only knows their Capacitys and Opportunitys, and who therefore alone can determine whether they have made the Enquiry as diligently as they cou'd, or no. Ay, but says Sir H. 'They have not sufficiently enquir'd; for if they 'had, they wou'd by consequence not be occasionally, but 'heartily and sincerely reconcil'd to the Church.' Sir H. shou'd have said constantly and entirely, if he wou'd have talk'd charitably or agreeably to the tenor of his Argument here. So then with Sir H. enquiring into the Nature and Excellency of the Church, and conforming uninterruptedly to it, are the same thing. Now Sir H. speaks out, what he has been but muttering before. And the Dissenters are to be punish'd by Deprivations and Incapacitys, that they may be forc'd to conform. And not as he has been pretending all this while, that they may be dispos'd for Conviction, by being made to wish, that they cou'd conform, in order to make 'em enquire into the Nature and Excellency of the Church they are to conform to. And tho indeed 'tis no difference to the Dissenter, whether he be punish'd to make him conform to the Church, or whether he be punish'd, that thereby by being brought to wish he cou'd conform, and enquiring into Conformity, he may be convinc'd 'tis his Duty; yet the latter is the fairer pretence for a Persecutor to make of the two. So that I'm sorry for the Truth's sake, Sir H. cou'd think of either of these Methods; and for his Reputation's sake, that he did not rather keep to the last.

Pref. p. 2. §. 1.

5. But

5. But Sir H. thinks that if depriving and incapacitating the Dissenters of all Offices won't do any Service to the Church, yet that at least 'tis no Injury to the Dissenters. Because they have *no Title* to hold Offices, or so much as to the capacity of holding 'em, *by the Act of Toleration.* For it is said, 'That the 'Act of Toleration makes no Provision, that any Dissenters 'from the National Church shou'd be thereby intitled or qua-'lify'd for publick Offices and Employments.' And that therefore to disqualify 'em is not contrary to the Toleration. Admirably well argued! No more does it make any Provision, that any Dissenter from the National Church shou'd be thereby intitled and qualify'd to possess an Estate; and does it therefore follow, that to incapacitate the Dissenters for possessing an Estate, is not contrary to the Act of Toleration? A Dissenter enjoys his Rights and Privileges by the same Laws that other Men do. Some penal Laws had depriv'd the Dissenters of several of those Rights: and all that the Toleration does, is to restore those that were taken away; but it can't restore those that never were taken away. Now the Capacity of holding a Place, and the actual Possession of one, were never taken from an Occasional Conformist by any Law whatsoever: nor therefore does the Occasional Conformist want a Clause in the Act of Toleration to restore 'em. B.p.3. §.3.

Nor can it be said, that to deprive and incapacitate the Dissenters of all Offices, is *not inconsistent with the Act of Toleration.* Sir H. indeed says it is not, upon this Reason; Because the Toleration only exempts the Dissenters from the Penalty's of certain Laws mention'd and enumerated in that Act. And if a Bill had pass'd to incapacitate Dissenters for holding Offices, Sir H. says it had inflicted no Penalty which the Toleration exempts 'em from. No, but it wou'd have inflicted a new Penalty: It wou'd have been a Penalty in the nature of a Fine to those who possess some sort of Places, and in some Instances without a 'salvo Contenemento.' And it wou'd have been a Penalty and a Temporal Punishment upon all, for not conforming to the National Church, instead of the gentle Methods of Reason, Arguments, and a good Example. The Toleration does not exempt the Dissenters from being burnt in the Cheek: But I suppose if a Law shou'd pass to burn 'em all in the Cheek, Sir H. wou'd hardly think it B.p.3. §.2.

it was consistent with the Toleration. For the Act of Toleration being an ease given to tender Consciences, all Penalties are inconsistent with it. And if this incapacitating Bill had pass'd, a new Act of Toleration wou'd have been as necessary to exempt the Dissenters from it, and to restore 'em to their Capacity, as the Act of Toleration, which pass'd in the first Year of the Reign of K. William and Q. Mary of ever Glorious Memory, was to restore 'em to other Rights, and to remove other Penaltys, which were in force against 'em. Indeed Sir H. pretends, that the Occasional Conformists stood excluded from Places, by the plain Intent and Meaning of the Corporation and Test Acts. If they had, there wou'd have been more force in Sir H's Argument, because the Act of Toleration has not exempted the Dissenters from the Hardships of those acts. But I hope to convince the Reader in another place, that the Exclusion of Occasional Conformists, is neither the meaning of the Acts, nor the Design of the Framers of them. I shall only say this in answer at present, that Sir H. knows very well, that this wou'd not pass for the plain Intent and Meaning of those Acts in Westminster-Hall: Or if it wou'd, there had been no need of this Bill, which Sir H. has taken so much pains to defend.

Having premis'd this, I believe we may be able to answer the *Querys* Sir H. puts upon this Head, in which he every where mightily abounds; and with this Peculiarity, that tho Querys are Appeals to the common sense of Mankind, upon the confidence that no body can disagree with the Querist, Sir H. generally puts his, where there's the greatest need of Arguments to convince, and where the Reason of the thing is the most against him. The first Query is,

B. p. 3. §. 3. 'Whether there be one word in the whole Act,' i. e. of Toleration, 'to that purpose,' *viz.* of qualifying a Dissenter for publick Offices and Employments? Answ. No. Nor need there be any such Clause in that Act, to make the disqualifying of Dissenters a Persecution. Qu. 'Did the Dissenters ever desire any such thing?' Answ. What thing do you mean? To be qualify'd? Yes, they think they are qualify'd by Occasional Conformity according to Law; and desire to continue so; and wou'd think it very hard if their Case may not be alter'd for the better, that it should be alter'd for the worse. Qu. 'Or did they desire

'any

'any thing more than Liberty of Conscience to serve 'God in their own way?' Answ. No. And therefore they desire to be free from all Deprivations and Incapacitys, for serving God sometimes in a Church, and sometimes in a Meeting, which is one way by which they think they can serve him. He goes on, Qu. 'And to enjoy their Libertys 'and Propertys?' Answ. Some Places are Freeholds and a part of their Property, and therefore they desire not to be divested of 'em; and a Capacity to enjoy a Place is their Right, and a part of English Liberty; and therefore they hope they shan't be depriv'd of it neither, for serving God in their own way; nor that a Law shou'd pass to do it, upon which they shou'd find themselves 'troubled with Prosecu- 'tions for Conscience only.' So falsly is it said, that 'this Ded. p. 3. 'Bill only secur'd the Establish'd Government in Church §. 2. 'and State, by such gentle Methods as are consistent with 'the Act of Toleration. For in a word, 'tis equally inconsistent with a Toleration to take away any Privilege, the Person tolerated enjoys by virtue of the Act of Toleration it self, or by any other Law; and equally inconsistent with the Toleration to enact a Law, that has a Penalty which that Act has exempted a Dissenter from; or to enact a Law that inflicts a Penalty, which not existing before the Act of Toleration, that Act cou'd not exempt him from. And 'tis but quibbling instead of arguing to assert the contrary, and to defend the Bill by such an Assertion.

6. But it will be said, that if the Dissenters are capable of publick Employments by the Act of Toleration, or by any other Law; *yet that they ought not to be suffer'd to continue so*, because they are Hypocrites and Schismaticks. All Dissenters but Occasional Conformists are barr'd already, and they it seems ought to be: And here lys the Strength of what may be said against 'em. For tho we have prov'd the Right a Dissenter has to a Toleration in general, and shew'd that an Occasional Conformist has the same Right with other Dissenters, and that depriving and incapacitating him is a Persecution, which is neither proper to convince him, nor to dispose him to Conviction, and that 'tis inconsistent with the Act of Toleration; yet if we can't shew that the charge of Hypocrisy and Schism ought not to impeach their Right, the

main Objections won'd be left unanswer'd. I shall therefore apply my self more particularly to consider 'em. First it is said in proof, that upon the Supposition they have a Right to some Places and to a Capacity for all, yet that that Right shou'd not be continu'd to 'em, because they are *Hypocrites.* E.p.6.§.6. Sir H. says, their Separation is a wilful one, and that they only conform for an Office, tho 'tis a pretty odd Reason he assigns, viz. because every Man that has an Office does conform.

But, 1. The Occasional Conformists desire leave to be heard to the Plea of Hypocrisy, that's made use of against 'em, and alledg that the Fact is false, and the Consequence unjust. They in the first place lay it down that they are *no Hypocrites.* A Hypocrite is one whose Actions are inconsistent with his Principles, and who is *conscious that they are so.* The bare Inconsistency of a Man's Principles with his Actions can't make a Man a Hypocrite, because that Inconsistency may proceed from Ignorance, Inadvertency or Mistake. And tho a Man that's guilty of these may be a weak Man, yet no Man is a Hypocrite thro mere Weakness: And if Inconsistency makes a Hypocrite, shew me the Man that's sincere. For since the Christian Principles are all unexceptable, no Man that professes them can at all times be consistent with 'em, but he that's perfect. Hence it follows, that Malice and Design must enter into the Character of a Hypocrite; and the Man's Principles must not only be inconsistent with his Practices, or with some other of his Principles, but he must be conscious of that Inconsistency too. So that if it could be made out, against what the Occasional Conformists have said for the Consistency of the Practice of Occasional Conformity with their Principles, that 'tis inconsistent with 'em; yet till it can be made out, that they are self-condemn'd and conscious of that Inconsistency, it can never be said that they are Hypocrites. If Inconsistencys were the Test of Hypocrites, the Dissenters think they shou'd not be the only Men that cou'd not stand it. And that if the pretended Inconsistency of going sometimes to a Meeting and sometimes to a Church, were sufficient to prove a Dissenter an Hypocrite, going sometimes to a Cathedral and at others to a Parish Church, sometimes to a Church subject to Episcopal Jurisdiction, and sometimes to

one

one exempt from it, wou'd fix the same Character upon a Churchman. And I'm persuaded, tho some Persons are pleas'd to stigmatize their Brethren in every breath with the black Character of a Hypocrite, for that which at most can never be prov'd to be more than a well-meant mistaken Practice; yet it wou'd hardly be born in the Dissenters, if they should deal as freely with their Brethren of the Church, and return this good Language, for their taking Oaths upon the Occasion of a good Place, or a good Benefice: Or for their saying, they are mov'd by the Holy Ghost to take the Orders of a Priest, tho they are never mov'd, but when a good Provision (or a Title, as 'tis call'd) moves 'em at the same time: Or for a Chapter's praying to God to move 'em to choose a proper Person to be a Bishop, when the Congè d'eslire leaves 'em not so much room for a Choice, as Hobson did his Fellow Traveller, when he let him choose whether he wou'd have what he gave him, or none at all.

But supposing the Occasional Conformists to be Hypocrites, it does not follow, that they ought to lose the benefit of a Toleration, unless they are injurious to the Society, or some Member of it. For Hypocrisy is no *Civil Crime*, 'tis no Offence against the Society; and therefore 'tis not the Magistrate's business to restrain it by Laws and Penaltys. 'Tis an Offence against God indeed, and won't fail of a just Punishment from him in this World or the next. But the Cognizance of it is not committed to the Magistrate, any more than the Cognizance of Lying, of unclean Thoughts, Malice or Covetousness, or of a thousand other Crimes, which no State ever thought of restraining. If Hypocrisy comes to be immediately injurious to the Society, it falls under the Magistrate's notice: Butthen 'tis the Injury that is punish'd and not the Hypocrisy. And when the Occasional Conformist shall become a Breaker of the Peace as well as an Hypocrite, he won't pretend to the benefit of a Toleration.

And indeed that the Punishment of Hypocrisy is foreign to the business of a Magistrate, not only appears from his want of a Commission to punish it, and that to punish it is not necessary to the Ends of Society, which are to be the measure of all Laws; but because it wou'd be *impracticable*. For Hypocrisy

pocrisy lying in the Consciousness of the Inconsistency of a man's Actions and Principles, is a Crime not capable of being describ'd by a Law, so as to bear a Trial: For what Evidences can swear (unless some such as were us'd within our memory, whose Crime was Impudence and not Hypocrisy) that the Occasional Conformist is conscious of this Inconsistency? And what Judg or Jury can find or condemn it? Actions can only come under their notice; and tho 'Scribere' may be 'Agere', yet surely 'Cogitare' can't. A Crime of this Spiritual nature can have no Judg but Him that trys the Heart and the Reins, and who not only knows the Thoughts of our Hearts, but the Relation and Reference they bear to one another.

But tho the Occasional Conformists are satisfy'd that they are not guilty of Hypocrisy, and that Hypocrisy is a Crime not liable to Civil Punishment, nor capable of Trial and Conviction; yet I believe I may venture to make this *Proposal* in their Name, That they will contentedly stand excluded from all Offices, when all other Hypocrites shall be excluded too: And particularly when the State Hypocrites shall; whom they can't but think more dangerous than themselves: Such, I mean, as have refus'd to sign the Association, or take the Oaths, or such who have talk'd openly against 'em, till accepting or keeping a good Place made it necessary. If Hypocrisy be the Crime to be punish'd in an Occasional Conformist, then all Hypocrisy is to be punish'd; or else when the Occasional Conformists are pretended to be punish'd for Hypocrisy, something else must be meant. But when all State Hypocrites shall be debar'd from Places, the Occasional Conformists think, their Country won't want their Service: and so will willingly see themselves laid aside. Tho they are afraid if the Exclusion should be in general of all Hypocrites, it wou'd go with us here as it did at Rome in times of extraordinary difficulty; and that there wou'd be more Places than Candidates and Officers to fill 'em: Or as it went at the Trial of the Woman taken in Adultery, and brought before our Saviour, there wou'd be too many convicted Criminals, to leave any to be Judges.

Thus the Occasional Conformists, in the first place, think they have remov'd the Bar, that's laid against their Plea to a Toleration: And the Dissenters desire in the 2d place to be heard to the Charge of Schism that's made against theirs.

And

And in this case they deny the Fact, and disallow of the Consequence, as the Occasional Conformists did in the other; and neither think themselves guilty of Schism, nor that Schism forfeits a Man's Right to a Toleration. They in the first place deny the Fact, and plead that they are not guilty of *Schism*, as it is ~~describ'd and forbid in the *Holy Scriptures*~~. For Nonconformity does not dissolve the Ty, by which a Dissenter is united to the Mystical Body of Christ. Love to all the Members of that Sacred Body, what Place soever they hold, or what Function soever they perform, or tho never so differently cloth'd and attir'd, has made him one with it. And notwithstanding these Diversitys, he loves all the Members of this Holy Communion, he honours 'em; He has a concern for 'em, and a studious desire to serve 'em; He halves their Sorrows, and receives a sensible Pleasure from their Joys; He envys not their Honors, and chearfully bears their Reproach and Shame. And whilst he feels this Sympathy with all the Members, he hopes he may be pretty secure, that he partakes of that Life and Spirit which animates and cements the Whole: and that he's not a benum'd or a dead Member, which receives none of that Influence from the Head, that directs and governs all the living ones.

And as Love has united him to this Sacred Body; so he's satisfy'd, that till Uncharitableness shall dissolve this Holy Band, nothing can divide him from this Community. He may indeed endeavor to be serviceable to himself, and useful to his Fellow-Members, in a different way from some others of 'em. But he's not much concern'd at the Clamors rais'd against him for this *Difference*, whilst he does not manage it uncharitably: 'Since Differences of Gifts may proceed from the same Spirit, 'and different Administrations from the same Head and Lord; 'and all of 'em may be for the profit and advantage of the 'Whole.' And if after all he should be mistaken; and this Difference should not be so serviceable, as an entire Uniformity would be; yet he thinks a mere Mistake concerning the best way of being serviceable, can't rend and divide him from this mystical Community. And he's conscious of no design to disserve his Fellow Members, or not to serve 'em at all. For whence does it necessarily follow, that a Dissenter manages his Differences from the Establish'd Church uncharitably, or that he has selfish Ends to serve by 'em; or that they proceed from

from overvaluing himself, or undervaluing his Brother; from being too fond of one Christian, or neglecting, despising, hating and envying another * ? He that is uncharitable in such Instances, and from such indulged Lusts as these, is only

---

* *These several Instances of Schism are so many Instances of Uncharitableness: And therefore St. Paul with the greatest propriety imaginable, prescribes Charity as the cure of Schism, in* 1 *Cor. Chap.* 13. *after he had elegantly describ'd the nature of Schism in the* 12*th: And no Remedy could reach the whole of the case so effectually. For Charity is contrary to every Spring and Instance of Schism: For* 1*st* it seeketh not its own; 2*dly*, is not puffed up, *nor* vaunts it self; 3*dly*, is kind; 4*thly*, rejoiceth only in the Truth; 5*thly*, envieth not; 6*thly*, does not behave it self unseemly: *For it* thinks no Evil, suffers long, is not easily provok'd: *Ch.* 13. *Ver.* 4, 5, 6. *The several Instances of Schism, which we have mention'd, and to which Charity is oppos'd, may be found in most or all the Places of Scripture, where Schism is spoken of.* (1*st.*) *A Difference, that as such wou'd be no Schism, becomes Schism when it is uncharitably manag'd; and this is commonly an Ingredient of most Schisms spoken of in Scripture. In the* 1 *Cor.* 1. 11. *'tis call'd* Contention; *and in the* 3. 3. Strife. *The* (2*d*) *Instance of Schism is describ'd* 16 *Rom.* 17, 18. *where we are told, that those* that cause Divisions, serve not our Lord Jesus Christ; but by good words and fair speeches deceive the Hearts of the Simple. *The* (3*d*) *Instance of Schism we are forbid in Rom.* 12. 3. *where St. Paul* thro the Grace given him commands every Man that was among them, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly of himself, according as God had dealt to every man the measure of Faith. *The Pride of the Rich, in eating their Love Feasts before the Poor, was possibly the Schism that St. Paul reprimands* 2 *Cor.* 18. 21, 22. *The* (4*th*) *is forbid at Ver.* 10. *where St. Paul commands them* to be kindly affectioned one to another, in honour preferring one another; *and more expressly in* 1 *Cor.* 12. *from the* 12*th Verse, to the end of that Chapter: where the Apostle by the just temperament of the Usefulness and Comeliness of the several Parts of the Body, and the Sympathy and Care that each Member has thereupon of the whole, elegantly expresses the nature of this Instance of Schism; which consists in despising our Fellow Christians. And the Corinthians overvaluing their own Gifts, and despising those of their Brethren, was very probably the occasion of the* 11, 12, 13, *and* 14 *Chapters of his* 1*st Epistle to them; in which he fervently animates them against it. The Schism of the Corinthians, which St. Paul reproves 'em for in the* 1*st Chapter of his first Epistle, may serve as a proof of the* (5*th*) *Instance. In the* 10*th Verse he* beseeches 'em, that there be no Divisions among 'em: but that they be perfectly join'd together in the same Mind, and in the same Judgment; *which was,* that no Man should glory in *particular* Men, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, 1 *Cor.* 3. 21, 22. *and that they should* not think of [*particular*] men above what is written: that no one of them should be puffed up for one against another; *but should think Paul and Apollos* Ministers of Christ, ch. 3. v. 5. and Stewards of the Mysteries of God, ch. 4. v. 1. *An Instance of the* (6*th*) *is in the* 3 Chap. 3. *since there were* Envyings *and* Divisions *amongst 'em.*

concern'd

concern'd for himself, or for some particular Members of Christ's Body, in opposition to others; but can never be truly concern'd for 'em all; since he's not concern'd for 'em as Members of that Body, but as Members passing under some peculiar Denomination; and consequently must be the Schismatick that is describ'd and reprimanded in the Holy Scriptures.

If any Dissenter should be uncharitable in these respects, and from such Principles, he must necessarily come under this unhappy Character. But there is no necessity, because a Man dissents from the Church, that he should deserve it, or that he should not because he conforms. These are Crimes which *Conformists* and *Nonconformists* are *equally capable of*, since they are not to be avoided by mere Conformity, nor perpetrated by a mistaken Non-conformity: but consist in Uncharitableness, founded in proneness to Strife; in selfish Designs; Pride or Insolence; Fondness of one Christian, or Slight and Hatred to another. And since these are the Springs, and the very Quintessence of Schism, 'tis not difficult to determine, which of the Two are most liable to the Guilt and the Temptation: Whether the Dissenters, who are expos'd to the Cross by their Dissent, and who only beg leave to differ from the Establish'd Church themselves, and to think their own Ministers and Churches better suted to the Ends of their Edification, without condemning Conformity in others, or without denying many of the Ministers of the Establish'd Church the Character of Learning and Piety, or the Church it self that of a true one: Or They, whose Conformity is accompany'd with Worldly Advantages, as well as Spiritual; and who would engross 'em both to themselves: Excluding other Men from the Divine Presence in the next World, and from the regular and ordinary means of Grace in this.

Thus we see the Schism, that's so severely inveigh'd against in the Holy Scripture, is Uncharitableness; and wherever that is not to be found, be there what other Differences or Separations you will, there is no Schism. And since the Dissenters are not chargeable with the Scripture Notion of Schism, they care not under what charge they ly of Schism in Mens account. They pay a great deference to the Judgment of the Fathers, and the Opinions of great Divines; but they have

learnt to call no man Master but Christ, and to stand in awe of no man's Judgment but the Lord's. And therefore if Fathers or Divines won'd teach 'em new Notions of Schism, they can't receive 'em, if they disagree with the Doctrines of their great Prophet. And if they shou'd be condemn'd by them, yet they know their Lord, who will judg according to none but the Sacred Rule, will upon an Appeal to him reverse their Decision. And yet the Dissenters think they are not chargeable with the Schism, which is describ'd and condemn'd by the Fathers and modern Divines, neither. Schism, *in the Opinion of the Fathers* of the three first Centurys, according to a very impartial Representation of the Notions and Practice of those Times, which has yet receiv'd no Answer, is an unnecessary Desertion of a lawful Bishop. And a lawful Bishop in their Writings, is the Pastor of a single Congregation, chosen by the Majority of the Members of that Church, approv'd by the neighbouring Pastors, and ordain'd by the Imposition of their Hands. And that which they took to be an unnecessary Desertion of this Bishop, was deserting him, tho he was not chargeable with Heresy, Apostacy or Immorality. Now certainly, according to this Notion of Schism, the *Dissenters can't be chargeable with it*, who bore so violent a Persecution, rather than be guilty of this unnecessary Desertion of their lawful Bishops in 62: Who were not ejected for Heresy, Apostacy or Immorality; but for not conforming to impos'd Rites: A Compliance which wou'd never have been urg'd by the best of the Fathers, who always esteem'd one Church's Imposing Rites upon another, as an Act of Tyranny in the Imposer.

Enquiry into the Constit. Discip. Unity and Worship of the Primit. Church, Part 1. p. 63-67. 214--218.

P. 2:3.

Thus the Dissenters think they stand clear'd from the Scriptural and Ecclesiastical Charge of Schism. But Divinity, which shou'd indeed be nothing but an Account of the Scheme of the Scriptures, but which happens oftner to be any thing besides, gives another Notion of Schism. And tho it does not import a Christian much what that Schism is, nor who is chargeable with it; yet since this Theological Scarecrow has frighted men mightily of late, it may possibly be of some service to see whether the Dissenters are guilty of the Schism charg'd upon 'em by the *Modern English Divines.* Schism in their opinion is an unnecessary Separation from a lawful Esta-

blish'd

blish'd Church. 'Tis plain that this is no Scripture Notion of Schism; for the Corinthians were guilty of Schism, when they were gather'd together. But be it a Definition of what it will, when 'tis understood, it will be at the same time understood, that the Dissenters are not included in it. (1.) *Separation* in this Definition can't mean merely a Local one: for then every Congregation wou'd be Schismatical, since 'tis locally separated from another. (2.) Neither can it mean bare Non-Communion; for then a Man, who never communicated with any Church but his Parish one, wou'd be a Schismatick: whereas it wou'd be very strange, that a Man shou'd be a Schismatick for communicating with the Congregation, which he is oblig'd to communicate with, by the Rules of the Church. (3.) Nor can it mean a bare Difference in Worship or Jurisdiction: For then either Parish-Churches, and Churches subject to Episcopal Jurisdiction, or Cathedrals and Exemptions must be Schismatical Churches; for Cathedrals and Parish-Churches have many differences in their manner of Worship; and Exemptions are not subject to Episcopal Jurisdiction as others are. (4.) Nor can it mean bare Non-Communion founded on this difference; for then a Man living in a Parish exempted from Episcopal Jurisdiction, or that always worships in a Cathedral, and never communicates with any other, which a Man may do and remain a good Churchman, must be a Schismatick. And if it did mean a bare Non-Communion founded on this difference, the Occasional Conformists cou'd not be included, because they do sometimes join in Communion with the Church; whom I suppose the Framers of this Definition don't design to excuse. (5.) Nor can it mean an avow'd abstinence from Communion, founded upon a difference in Worship or Jurisdiction (which I believe is the common Acceptation of the word) any more than a bare Non-Communion founded on that difference. For if it did, a Parishioner of an exempted Parish, who liking the Discipline and the Preaching of the Minister in that Parish better than in any other, and who shou'd upon that account never communicate with any other Parish Church, would be a Schismatick: Which cannot be granted any more, than that a Man shou'd be a Schismatick, for communicating constantly with his Parish-Church. So that there is no sense of Separation, by which

1 Cor. 11. 18, 21.

many Members being in sole and constant Communion with the Church of England will not be Schismaticks, as well as Dissenters. And for this reason I can't see, that the Schism of the Dissenters can be properly included under the general notion of Separation.

Neither can I see, that when 'tis restrain'd to an *Unnecessary* Separation from a lawful Establish'd Church, it will describe the Dissenters Schism any better; since then it will neither exclude all Churchmen, nor comprize all Dissenters. In order to shew this, we'l consider the other parts of the Definition. By an Unnecessary Separation is meant a Separation that is not made upon the account of some sinful Terms of Communion. Well, be it so. All Dissenters think an entire and constant Communion with the Church wou'd be to them upon sinful Conditions: For it would, in their Opinion, be upon Condition of being Partys to sinful Impositions, Corruptions and faulty Defects, and of less Edification. And the same Scripture that commands us to be Holy, commands us to grow in
2 Pet. 3, 18. Holiness, express'd there by its Parts, 'Grace, and the 'Knowledg of Jesus Christ.' And the Command that enjoins us the End, enjoins us the Means which we think necessary to that End. And by consequence it wou'd be sinful in a Dissenter to communicate with her, who thinks other Christian Assemblys more likely to further his spiritual Improvements than the Church. All Dissenters agree in these Principles, tho they differ in applying 'em. Some being of Opinion, that the Consequence of these Principles is, that even an Occasional and Partial Joining with the Church is unlawful, because they think, that the bare doing of that makes them Partys to the Faults of the Church: Whilst others think, for the Reasons alledg'd before, that 'tis only Constant and Total Communion that can be said to abet 'em; and upon that account, the only Communion whose Conditions are unlawful.

And by this it appears, that all Separation from a *Lawful* Church is not Schism: For better Edification is a Reason for Separation, as well as avoiding Communion with a false Church; and a good Christian may separate not only from a false Church, but from an ill Constitution of a sound one. And therefore whilst the Definition stands as it does, it is a Contradiction to it self; for there may be a necessary Separation

ration from a lawful Church, which the Definition implicitly denys. So that, if the other parts of it were just, it cou'd not agree with the thing it defin'd, unless to lawful be added the best constituted. And unless it run thus, 'that Schism is 'an unnecessary Separation from a Lawful and the best consti-'tuted Establish'd Church;' and then the Dissenters are not concern'd in it.

And as by omitting this the Definition is defective, so the last word, *viz. Establish'd*, is superfluous, and makes the Definition redundant. By an Establish'd Church is meant one that has certain Privileges granted it under the Sanction of human Laws. Now this Establishment may indeed give Privileges to the Church, but can never make it a true one, or give it a good Constitution: And it may make it penal for me to separate from it, but it can't make it sinful. For the Magistrate has no Commission to give Laws to the Church, nor has the Church any Power to make any: nor does Christ's Laws want any human Sanction, nor can the Society receive any Benefit by it. How therefore an Establishment of the Church makes it Schism for a Man to separate from it, I confess is not plain to me, unless the neglect of a Magistrate's Command in things which he has no Authority to command, be the thing that's meant by Schism.

And indeed if Schism be an unnecessary Separation from an Establish'd Church, as well as a lawful Church, there cou'd be no Schism before Constantine's time (above 300 years after there were Christian Churches) since before that time the Lawful Church had no Establishment. And according to this Opinion, I hope 'twill be allow'd that the Episcopal Party in Scotland are Schismaticks for separating from Presbytery, which is the Scotch Establishment. But putting the Case, that not complying with the Laws which the Magistrate has made concerning the Church be Schism: then as before those Laws were made, there cou'd be no Schism; so neither can they be guilty of it, for whose Benefit those Laws are dispens'd with. And therefore since the Act of Toleration has dispens'd with all those penal Laws, that were in force against the Dissenters, they can't now be Schismaticks according to this notion of Schism. Nay since the Act of Toleration has not only exempted the Dissenters from the force of the penal Laws, but

has

has given 'em certain Immunitys and Privileges; I know no reason why the Churches of the Dissenters may not be said to be establish'd by the Act of Toleration, as well as the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity; unless the many Privileges the Church has by the one, and the few the Dissenters enjoy by the other, can make the difference. At least I don't see why this mayn't be asserted, if we may rely upon the Authority of Sir H's Defender; who, upon another occasion, says, that where two Forms of Worship are establish'd by the original Constitution, neither can be said to be Dissenters from the Establishment. By this time, I hope, the Meaning and the Impropriety of this Definition is sufficiently understood; and how unapplicable it is to the Separation of the Dissenters. Since Schism is not included in Separation; nor is the Separation of the Dissenters unnecessary; nor a Separation from a lawful Church always sinful; and that as there may be a Schism from a lawful Church which has no Establishment, so there may be a Separation from a lawful establish'd Church, where there's no Schism.

Peace and Union, or a Defence of Sir H. M's Treatise on the Occasional Bill, P. 5. §. 4.

But if Schism did consist in a Separation from a lawful establish'd Church, they are *not the Separatists who separate*, because that lawful Church has something which they think defective or unlawful, or which they suspect to be so: But they are the Separatists, who force the others to separate by their Impositions, who make things necessary which they acknowledg to be indifferent, and which they know others scruple as unlawful; and who continue without some other things, which they own to be very desirable. For then the former are debar'd, and don't debar themselves; they are excluded, but don't separate; and are driven from the Communion of the latter, but don't leave it. He wou'd be thought mad, if he were in good earnest, who shou'd fix Rules of Conversation, which he own'd were not necessary to regulate it, and which he knew I wou'd not comply with; and shou'd afterwards cry out upon me for an ill-bred Man, because I would not make one of the Company: And He himself wou'd be thought the ill-bred Man, and guilty of an impertinent Sarcasm, if he were in jest. So that 'tis to be hop'd, that no body who is either a Friend to the Truth or to the Church, will for the future use a Definition, that may be of some service indeed to the Dissenters, but can never

never help to support the Church, nor to give us the true notion of Schism.

But if Schism after all consists in a Separation from the true Church of England, the Gentlemen that use this Definition shou'd tell us, which *of the Churches of England* they mean, since there are two at present which lay claim to the Name. This is the more necessary, since those * who have wrote for the Occasional Conformity Bill, are most of 'em Jacobites and Nonjurors; and stile themselves High Churchmen. When these Men charge the Dissenters with Schism, they mean nothing but a Separation from their separate Assemblys. But certainly no Churchman can think this any Objection to the Dissenters, or can wish that the Nonconformists wou'd quit their Meetings, where the Government is fervently pray'd for, and which are tolerated by Law, to go to the Conventicles of the Jacobites, to hear Sedition taught against our lawful Sovereign in a Cockloft.

* *Author of the Regale and Pontificate. Wolfstript. Moderation truly stated. Occasional Conformity an unjustifiable Practice. The Defender of Sir H. M's Treatise, &c. who seems to be a Man of the same Principles.*

Thus we see the Dissenters stand acquitted from the Charge of Schism, according to what notion soever it is laid, whether of the Scripture, the Fathers, or Divines. But if it shou'd be resolv'd, notwithstanding all we have said, that they are Schismaticks, yet they think *they may be good Subjects*, and that they have not lost their Title to a Toleration. A Schismatick can be no Member of the Church, but he may be an useful one in the State. He can't indeed partake of Ecclesiastical Privileges, because he has no Communion with the Church: But why shou'd he be debar'd Civil Ones? For Schism does not necessarily make a Man a seditious Subject: Where it does, let the Sedition be punish'd by the Magistrate. But so long as a Schismatick remains peaceable, he has a Right to a Toleration, as we have prov'd before. Sir H. M. indeed pretends that the Dissenters are dangerous to the State, I suppose because they are Schismaticks: But I shall consider that Question separately by it self in the Second Part, and so shall take no notice of it here.

This is what the Dissenters plead for their Occasional Conformity, and their stated Dissent, and the Right they have to an absolute Toleration. But they think 'tis as much the *Interest*, as

as the Duty of the Government, to grant and maintain it.

'Tis the Interest of the Government, because 'tis its Duty. Duty and Interest, Propriety and Advantage, being as inseparably connected as Virtue and Reward, Vice and Punishment. But it will appear to be more particularly the Interest of the Government, by running over the *Disadvantages* of the contrary Course. For to deprive the Dissenters of any Privilege they now enjoy, and particularly of the Offices which any of them hold at present, or of the Capacity they have to enjoy them for the future, is to weaken the Government. For it is to disoblige and discourage sober, industrious, wealthy, frugal Men. It is to deprive the Nation of the readiness of their Loans, and the Benefit of their Informations: 'Tis to rob it of the help and assistance of their Courage in the Camp, and of their skilful experience in our Fleet. It is to sap it of the Strength it receives from Persons, who are highly serviceable in a prudent discharge of the Commissions of Taxes, Peace and Lieutenancy, in the Bench of Aldermen, Common Council Men and Assistants, in the Courts of Judicature and Offices of State: In a word, of Men who cou'd assist in the making of wise Laws in Parliament, as well as any other of their Fellow-Citizens; and in the execution of 'em out of it.

To cashier such Men as these from all publick Offices and Employments, is not only, with one hand to cut off t'other, as Maximus told Valentinian, when he had murder'd Ætius his brave and faithful General; but 'tis with one hand to provoke the other to rebel against the whole: For 'tis not only the way to weaken the Government, but to endanger it. This it has a tendency to do, by tempting Men first to be Discontented and Uneasy; then to spread those Discontents among their Fellow-Citizens; in the next place, to betray us to Foreigners, by revealing the Counsels of the Government, and retarding its Business; till at last a number of these combin'd together, enter into Conspiracys, and don't stop at open Insurrections.

Procop. l. i. Vandal.

And as these are the natural Tendencys of such Measures; so they wou'd be the Consequences of 'em too, were the Dissenters such Subjects as their Enemys represent. Or if breaking in upon the Toleration shou'd not carry Men to this extremity, nor bring things to an open rupture; it might yet have as much worse consequences, by undermining the very Foundation

tion of our Constitution, as a latent Disease is more dangerous than one whose Symptoms break out, and at the same time point out the nature of the Distemper and its Cure. For it will destroy the Ballance between the several Partys in England, upon which the Ballance of Power between the three Estates depends. And it is upon that Ballance of Power, that the framing of good Laws depends, and the due execution of them; as the Ballance of Power does upon that of Partys. Nay, 'tis ruining the very Constitution it self, and at once breaks in upon the Prerogative which the Sovereign has to command any ones service that is capable to serve; and upon the Liberty every Man has to serve; and the Rights the Country has to be serv'd by 'em. In a word, whenever the Power of England shall be put into the hands of one Party, all the Prerogatives of the Crown and the Liberty's of the People, will be swallow'd up by that Party. The Will of that Party must be then instead of the Sovereign's Prerogative, and their Interest must come into the room of the general Good of the People.

But it will not only ruin us at home but *abroad* too. For by discovering our ill will to the Presbyterians and Occasional Conformists, it will disunite us more from the Scots, foment their Jealousys of us at present, and render an Union more impracticable for the future. And it will by the same Method beget a Distrust in those of our Allys, who are Presbyterians, of our Will; and by weakning us at home, beget an equal distrust in them of our Power to help them.

And if the *Church* shou'd promote such a Persecution, it must be at her own expence. For it must wound the State, upon whose Security her Safety depends. She must divide and weaken the Christian and the Protestant Interest by it, both at home and abroad; and ruin the Character of Veracity and Temper she has acquir'd by her Moderation, and the Credit she has gain'd, by being at present thought to deserve 'em both.

If these Reasons did not prove such a Restraint of useful Men, and such a Persecution of good Christians, against our true Interest at all times; yet certainly the present unhappy Circumstances of Affairs wou'd easily convince us 'twas *Unseasonable* at this: A time when all our danger is from a Potent Enemy abroad, who has the Treasures of the Indys to support his Tyranny, and has rob'd us of the Revenue of Trade that might

help to secure us from it; whose Counsels are unanimous and secret, and who is vigorous in all his Enterprizes; whilst we are irresolute, divided, and slow in ours. Sure all Heads, all Hands, all Purses are few enough to resist this powerful Adversary. Let us learn some of the Methods by which Rome became so great: She naturaliz'd all Strangers, admitted all her Citizens to the highest Honors without distinction, and laid aside all Quarrels and Divisions in times of publick danger, to unite against the common Foe. If the Cocks of the Game will spar it out, let it be after we have secured our selves from the Kite that hovers over our Heads, and aims at destroying us both. And when the State has had the assistance of the Dissenters against France, and the Church has call'd in their help against the Atheists, Deists and Socinians, in the Controversys and Disputes depending betwixt 'em; and when she shall by their assistance, have secur'd our common Religion and Libertys from their attempts; let her then, if it must be then, bend her Forces against these Enemys of lesser Importance.

If coming at the Truth, or the Mistakes in the Cause of the Protestant Dissenters, as far as it lys in any of these Points, were the *true and sole design* of the Disputants, methinks the present Age might hope to see an end of the Contest. The ready way seems easier and shorter than it has been thought and represented. Direct Answers to the Strength of the Cause it self, rather than the Weakness of its Managers; and to the Management rather than to the Persons or the Party who undertake it, wou'd not take up large Volumes, nor require Replys, Rejoinders and Replications, infinite in Bulk and Number, and equally tedious and impertinent. When the Partys come to manage their Cause in this way, it will no longer be suspected that they serve Interest more than Truth, nor doubted on whose side the Truth lys: But if instead of Arguments we use Charges and Invectives, and instead of Replys, Recriminations, we only dwindle into Satyrists, and by addressing our selves to Mens Passions, give the Standers by too much reason to think, that either we don't know our Cause, or distrust it; and that we rather design to incense and exasperate both the Partys, than to confirm or convince either. Nay if instead of consider-

ing

ing the Evidence of the Reasons that are brought, and the consistency of one with another, we compare Principles with Practices, and one Man's Principles with anothers, that happens to be of the same denomination; we may indeed come at the Truth of Facts, but never to that of Principles. Or if instead of considering all that can be possibly said for a Cause, we only consider what has been said, or what has been the least pertinently said, we are rather parrying to defend our selves than to protect the Truth, or to make a home thrust at Mens Mistakes and Errors; and must appear to the World, more like men fighting a Prize, than contending in good earnest for Opinions of Weight and Importance.

And yet this seems to be the *State* of the *Dispute*, as 'tis generally manag'd at *present*. He that looks into the Pamphlets that swarm against the Dissenters, like the Ægyptian Locusts, and darken the Truth as much as they did the Land, will instead of solid Arguments for constant Conformity, or calm Replys to the Reasons of the Dissenters for stated Nonconformity and an absolute Toleration, find Personal Charges and Invectives, that are either Fictitious, Antiquated or Impertinent. The old Story of Forty one, and of the Rye-house Plot, are new vampt, and set out to the best Advantage. And the Dissenters are represented as Regicides and Commonwealths-men. And I know not what feign'd Designs are trump'd up of introducing Harrington's Oceana, or the State of Noland; of abolishing Episcopacy, and of setting aside her present Majesty. The moderate Churchmen indeed generally share these Calumnys with the Dissenters. But when they have made the Dissenters, in Association with the moderate Churchmen, Enemys to the Church and the Nation, the next thing is to set the Dissenters at variance with the Dutch and Scots Presbyterians, and among themselves. The Independants are play'd against the Presbyterians, and the Presbyterians of 41 against those of our days, and the Occasional Conformists against the Constant Dissenters. All this may be talk'd of indeed as matter of Fact if we please; and a little pains wou'd shew both the Falsity of the Charge, and the Imprudence of those who make it. For when they are forc'd to break thro all Acts of Oblivion and Indemnity to look into the Story of 41, methinks it's a sign they han't much to say against the Dissenters since: And when they are forc'd to charge

Wolf stript, p. 21, 22, 33. *Moderation truly stated*, p. 74--78. *Mr. Wesleys defence of a Letter concerning the Educ. of Dissenters*, p. 20--24. 28--40. *Source of present Fears discover'd*, p. 11---18. *Hist. of last Parliam.* Pref. p. 6. *New Association, Part I. II. Wolf stript*, p. 40--48. 70--72. Ib. p. 77, 78, 79. *Moderation truly stated*, p. 74--77.

charge 'em with the Crimes, which illegal Proceedings and Persecutions tempted 'em to, and with none but feign'd and pretended ones, since Englishmen have had Liberty, and they a Toleration, it's a sign that the Crimes are not chargeable upon the Men or the good Usage of 'em, but the Hardships and Persecutions they underwent. And it's a shrewd Hint that the source of Malice and Invective against the English Presbyterians must be pretty near exhausted, when their Adversarys are forc'd to search into the Proceedings of the Scots Presbyterians, to find some fresh matter to accuse 'em of.

De Foe's Enquiry into Occasional Conformity, p. 10, 11, 12. *Sir H. M's Peace at Home*, Ded. p. 2. §. 2. p. 4. Pref. p. 2. §. 2. B. p. 7. §. 1.

In short, these Invectives wou'd make one think, if the Inveteracy of the Men who use 'em wou'd give us leave to do it, that it was nothing but refin'd Banter; and that they design'd a Vindication of the Dissenters, and the Satyr upon some other Folks. For certainly they must needs think that these Charges will put the Dissenters in mind, and provoke them to remind the World, that supposing they had been faulty many years ago, some Men have been guilty of the same or of *worse Crimes* since: For Treason against a whole Nation surpasses that which is committed against any single Person whatsoever: Selling us to France is a worse Crime than Rebellion, and a Friend to Arbitrary Power more dangerous than a Commonwealthsman. The Principles of passive Obedience are as pernicious as the deposing ones: And 'tis more inconsistent with the Doctrine of Non-Resistance to question a Prince's Title to the Throne, than his Right to command in a matter of Religion and Conscience. But yet a King who had an undoubted Title to the Crown, was brought to abdicate by other hands than those that murder'd one: And if Regicidies have been sainted, it was not with so much effrontery as Assassins have been absolv'd. Occasional Conformists can't be more dangerous to the Church, than Occasional Subjects must be to the State; nor Nonjurors less prejudicial than Fanaticks. And I can't persuade my self, but he that places all his Religion in Ceremonys and Episcopacy, and wou'd even depress the Authority of the Scriptures, to make that of Bishops or Ceremonys stand upon a level with it, is as bad a Christian as he that professes an Aversion or an Indifference to both.

Dissertationes in Iren. Auct. Hen. Dodwell. Diss. 1. §. 43.

But what does all this signify *to the main Cause*, supposing all the Charges true on one side, and all false on the other? Does it follow because the Dissenters were Regicides in forty eight, or remain Commonwealths-men; because they of our time differ in some points from the Dissenters of those, or because they don't agree among themselves; or because this or that particular Man has committed some slips in managing their Cause, that therefore no Men have a right to separate from the Worship of the Establish'd Church, or to erect Churches of their own, and to return to some parts of the Establish'd Worship on some Occasions; and that the Government has no Obligation, nor Interest to tolerate 'em in all this? Which are the chief Questions in the Dissenting Controversy.

But tho this has been but too generally the Method of managing this Dispute, how absurd soever, and contrary to the true way of managing it, it may upon reflection appear to be, I wou'd be understood to except Mr. *Hoadly* in a great measure out of the Charge. He has studiously sever'd abundance of personal matters from the Controversy; and has shewn the World both by his management of the Controversy it self, and by a later instance, that he neither wants the Parts nor the Temper that's necessary to bring this Dispute to a fair Issue. He has given a pregnant Instance that he can dispute with the Dissenters without being angry; and that he can write against 'em to convince 'em, and not to expose 'em, since he retains his desires to do 'em service. A truly Christian Temper, and a rare example of Meekness in a Divine; an Order which, by some certain Fatality, seems to imitate Moses and Elias in their furious Zeal, breaking the Tables of the Law, and calling for Fire from Heaven to consume their Adversarys, rather than Jesus Christ, the great example of Forgiveness, Love, Gentleness and Forbearance. And since Mr. Hoadly has met with so able and so fair an Adversary, the World may expect some new Light from their Debates. And yet I wish, so hard is it to lay aside Party and Passion, that Mr. Hoadly wou'd have wrote rather in defence of the Church than against the Dissenters; and rather against Dissenters than against this or that Party of them; and that he wou'd have apply'd himself to shew the Incon-

A Letter to a Clergyman in the Country.

Mr. Calamy.

Inconsistency of Nonconformity, rather than of the Men that don't conform, and have argu'd more 'ad Rem' and less 'ad Hominem.' For such a way of reasoning can only inform us of Characters, and not of Things; and the consequence of such Arguments can be no more than this, that the Dissenters are in the wrong, and not that the Principles, upon which a Man may dissent, are not right; that is to say, it only follows that the Nonconformists ought to Reform, and not that they do ill to Dissent.

However when any other Point in the Dissenting Controversy, shall be as fairly manag'd as those depending between these Antagonists; it may be justly *expected*, that the Dissenters shou'd think of *Replying*, or if they don't, as justly thought, that they can't. Whereas whilst their Antagonists continue to write as they do, it may be fairly suppos'd that the Dissenters have learnt so much from one that has very lately appear'd against 'em, as to take this Motto.

Sir. H. M. Pref. p. 2. ' Didicerunt illi maledicere, nos contemnere.'

And since that Worthy Gentleman has brought several Arguments in vindication of the Occasional Conformity Bill, which seem, for the most part, to be design'd *as real Objections against the Toleration of Dissenters and Occasional Conformists*, rather than as Invectives against the Dissenters and Occasional Conformists themselves; and that both the Noise which the Book has made, and the Character of its Author, all challenge a calm and impartial Consideration; we shall attempt it in the Second Part. But He must not be angry with me, who wou'd so industriously avoid the mixing of personal matters, that I conceal a Name, which 'tis neither worth his while, nor which can't be of any advantage to his Cause to know; it being of no Importance who writes, but what is written; unless one had so great a Name, and so many honorable Characters as Sir H. has, to put at the end of a pompous Title-page for the service of the Bookseller, and the Recommendation of the Book: which are Advantages, the Author professes, he neither envys Sir H. nor has himself.

FINIS.

A Vindication of the Miniſters of the Goſpel in and about London, *from the unjuſt Aſperſions caſt upon their former Actings for the Parliament, as if they had promoted the bringing of the* KING *to Capital Puniſhment. Printed in the Year* 1648.

IT cannot be unknown how much we, and other Miniſters of this City and Kingdom, that faithfully adher'd to the Parliament, have injuriouſly ſmarted under the ſcourge of evil Tongues and Pens, ever ſince the firſt eruption of the unhappy Differences and unnatural War between the King and Parliament, for our Obedience to the Commands and Orders of the Honourable Houſes, in their Conteſts with his Majeſty, and Conflicts with his Armys.

We are not ignorant of the over-buſy Intermedlings of Prelates and their Party heretofore, in over-ruling Civil Affairs, to the great endangering of Kingdoms, and of this in particular; when private Intereſts, ambitious Deſigns, Revenge, or other ſiniſter Ends, engag'd them beyond their Sphere. Howbeit, it cannot reaſonably (as we conceive) be denied, that Miniſters, as *Subjects*, being bound to obey the Laws and to preſerve the Liberties of the Kingdom, and having an Intereſt in them and the Happineſs of them, as well as others, may and ought (without incurring the juſt cenſure due to Buſy-bodies and Incendiaries) to appear, for preſerving the Laws and Liberties of that Commonwealth whereof they are Members, eſpecially in our caſe, when it was declar'd by the Parliament, that all was at ſtake, and in danger to be loſt. No, nor as *Miniſters* ought they to hold their peace, in a time wherein the Sins of Rulers and Magiſtrates, as well as others, have ſo far provok'd God, as to kindle the fire of his Wrath againſt his People. And yet, for this alone, the faithful Servants of God have in all Ages, thro the Malice of Satan and his Inſtruments, been traduc'd as Arch-Incendiaries, when only their Accuſers are indeed guilty of both laying the train, and of putting fire to it, to blow up a Kingdom.

An *Ahab* and his Sycophants think none ſo fit to bear the Odium of being the grand *Troubler of Iſrael*, as *Elijah*. Thus, the Popiſh Device was, to charge the *Gunpowder Treaſon* (had it taken effect) upon the *Puritans*: And if you believe *Tertullus*, even a *Paul* is a *peſtilent Fellow, a Mover of Sedition throughout the World*, a *Ringleader* of a *Sect*, and what not, but what he is. Yea, *Chriſt* himſelf (tho a Friend to Monarchy, even of Heatheniſh *Rome*) is proclaim'd *an Enemy to Cæſar*, to open a way to his Deſtruction, by their Malice, who never car'd for the Intereſt of *Cæſar*.

Wherefore, altho *with us*, who have had experience of like uſage, *it be a ſmall thing to be* thus *judged of men*, when we regard only our own particular Perſons: For, *if they call the Maſter of the Houſe Beelzebub, how much more thoſe of his Houſhold?* Yet when we conſider how much

it

it concerns the Honour of our Maſter, and the good of all, to preſerve our Miniſterial Function immaculate (our good Names being, in that relation, as needful to others, as a good Conſcience to our ſelves) we dare not but ſtand by and aſſert the Integrity of our Hearts, and the Innocency of all our Actings (in reference to the King and Kingdom) for which we are ſo much calumniated and traduc'd.

This we are compel'd to at this time, becauſe there are many who very confidently (yet moſt unjuſtly) charge us to have been formerly inſtrumental toward the taking away the Life of the King: And becauſe alſo there are others, who in their ſcurrilous Paſquils and Libels (as well as with their virulent Tongues) repreſent us to the World as a *bloody ſeditious Sect, and traitorous Obſtructers of what all the godly People of the Kingdom do earneſtly deſire for eſtabliſhing of Religion and Peace*, in that we ſtick at the *Execution* of the King, while yet we are (as they falſly affirm) content to have him *convicted* and *condemned*. All which we muſt, and do from our hearts diſclaim, before the whole World.

For when we did firſt engage with the Parliament, (which we did not till call'd thereunto) we did it with loyal Hearts and Affection towards the King and his Poſterity; not intending the leaſt hurt to his Perſon, but to ſtop his Party from doing further hurt to the Kingdom; not to bring his Majeſty to Juſtice (as ſome now ſpeak) but to put him into a better capacity to do Juſtice: *To remove the Wicked from before him, that his Throne might be eſtabliſh'd in Righteouſneſs*; not to dethrone and deſtroy him, which (we much fear) is the ready way to the Deſtruction of all his Kingdoms.

That which put any of us on at firſt to appear for the Parliament was, *The Propoſitions and Orders of the Lords and Commons in Parliament* (June 10. 1642.) for bringing in of Mony and Plate, *&c.* wherein they aſſur'd us that whatſoever ſhould be brought in thereupon, ſhould not be at all employ'd upon any other occaſion, than to maintain *the Proteſtant Religion, the King's Authority, his Perſon and his Royal Dignity, the free courſe of Juſtice, the Laws of the Land, the Peace of the Kingdom, and the Privileges of Parliament, againſt any Force which ſhall oppoſe them.*

And in this we were daily confirm'd and encourag'd more and more by their many ſubſequent Declarations and Proteſtations, which we held our ſelves bound to believe, knowing many of them to be godly and conſcientious Men, of publick Spirits, zealouſly promoting the common good, and labouring to free this Kingdom from Tyranny and Slavery, which ſome evil Inſtruments about the King endeavour'd to bring upon the Nation.

As for the preſent Actings at *Weſtminſter*, ſince the time that ſo many of the Members were by force ſecluded, divers impriſon'd, and others thereupon withdrew from the Houſe of Commons (and there not being that Conjunction of the two Houſes as heretofore) we are wholly unſatisfied therein, becauſe we conceive them to be ſo far from being warranted by

by ſufficient Authority, as that in our apprehenſions they tend to an actual Alteration (if not Subverſion) of that which the Honourable *Houſe of Commons*, in their *Declaration* of *April* 17. 1646. have taught us to call *the Fundamental Conſtitution and Government of this Kingdom*, which they therein aſſure us (if we underſtand them) they would never alter.

Yea, we hold our ſelves bound in duty to God, Religion, the King, Parliament and Kingdom, to profeſs before God, Angels and Men, that we verily believe that which is ſo much fear'd to be now in agitation, *the taking away the Life of the King*, in the preſent way of Trial, is not only not agreeable to any Word of God, the Principles of the Proteſtant Religion (never yet ſtain'd with the leaſt drop of Blood of a King) or the fundamental Conſtitution and Government of this Kingdom; but contrary to them, as alſo to the *Oath of Allegiance*, the *Proteſtation* of *May* 5. 1641. and the *Solemn League and Covenant*: from all or any of which Engagements, we know not any Power on Earth, able to abſolve us or others.

In which laſt, we have ſworn (*with Hands lifted up to the moſt high God*) *That we ſhall with ſincerity, reality and conſtancy, in our ſeveral vocations, endeavor with our Eſtates & Lives, mutually to preſerve and defend the Rights and Privileges of the Parliament, and the Liberties of the Kingdoms, and to preſerve and defend the King's Majeſty's Perſon and Authority, in the defence of the true Religion, and Liberties of the Kingdoms: That the World may bear witneſs with our Conſciences of our Loyalty, and that we have no thoughts or intentions to diminiſh his Majeſty's juſt Power and Greatneſs.*

And we are further tied by another Article of the ſame *Covenant*; *Not to ſuffer our ſelves, directly or indirectly, by whatſoever combination, perſwaſion or terror, to be divided or withdrawn from this bleſſed Union and Conjunction, whether to make defection to the contrary party, or to give our ſelves to a deteſtable indifferency or neutrality in this Cauſe, which ſo much concerns the glory of God, the good of the Kingdoms, and honour of the King: but ſhall all the days of our lives, zealouſly and conſtantly continue therein againſt all oppoſition, and promote the ſame according to our power againſt all lets and impediments whatſoever.* And this we have not only taken our ſelves, but moſt of us have by command of the Parliament adminiſtred it to others, whom we have thereby drawn in to be as deep as our ſelves in this publick Engagement.

Therefore, according to that our *Covenant*, we do in the Name of the Great God (to whom all muſt give a ſtrict account) warn and exhort all who either more immediately belong to our reſpective Charges, or any way depend on our Miniſtry, or to whom we have adminiſtred the ſaid *Covenant* (that we may not by our ſilence ſuffer them to run upon that highly provoking ſin of Perjury) to keep cloſe to the ways of God, and the rules of Religion, the Laws, and their Vows, in their conſtant maintaining the true Reform'd Religion, the fundamental Conſtitution and Government of this Kingdom, (not ſuffering themſelves to be ſeduc'd from it, by being drawn in to ſubſcribe the late Models, or *Agreement*

* Declar'd by both *Houſes*, (for the ſubſtance of it) to be *Deſtructive to the Being of Parliaments, and to the fundamental Government of the Kingdom*, in *Decemb.* 1647. yea, condemned heretofore by the *General*, and his *Council of War*, and one of the Soldiers ſhot to death for promoting it.

† Lev. 26.

‖ Ezek. 17. 2 Sam. 21.

*of the People**, which directly tends to the utter ſubverſion of the whole frame of the fundamental Government of the Land, and makes way for an univerſal toleration of all Hereſies and Blaſphemies, directly contrary to our *Covenant*, if they can but get their Abettors to cover them under a falſe guiſe of the *Chriſtian Religion*) as alſo in preſerving the Privileges of both Houſes of Parliament, and the Union between the two Nations of *England* and *Scotland*; to mourn bitterly for their own Sins, the Sins of the City, Army, Parliament and Kingdom, and the woful miſcarriages of the King himſelf (which we cannot but acknowledg to be many and very great) in his Government, that have coſt the three Kingdoms ſo dear, and caſt him down from his Excellency into an horrid pit of Miſery, almoſt beyond Example: And to pray that God would both give him effectual Repentance, and ſanctify that bitter Cup of Divine Diſpleaſure, that the Divine Providence hath put into his hand; as alſo that God would reſtrain the violence of Men, *that they may not dare to draw upon themſelves and the Kingdom, the blood of their Sovereign.*

And now, we have good reaſon to expect that they who brought us under ſuch a bond, and thereby led us into the neceſſity of this preſent *Vindication* and Manifeſtation of our Judgments and Diſcharge of our Conſciences, ſhould defend us in it. However, we reſolve rather to be of their number that tremble at his *Terrors* who is a *conſuming fire*, and will not fail to † *avenge the quarrel of his Covenant*, upon all that contemn it, than to be found among thoſe who *deſpiſe the Oath by breaking his Covenant*‖ (*after lifting up the hand*) altho it had been made but in Civil things only, and that with the worſt of Men.

C. Burges, D.D. Preacher at *Paul's Lond.*
Wil. Gouge, D. D. Paſtor of *Black-Fryars.*
Edm. Stanton, D. D. Paſtor of *Kingſton.*
Tho. Temple, D. D. Paſtor of *Batterſey.*
Geo. Walker, Paſtor of *John Evang.*
Edm. Calamy, Paſtor of *Aldermanbury.*
Jer. Whitaker, Paſtor of *Magd. Bermunſey.*
D. Cawdrey, Miniſt. of *Martins* in the *fields.*
William Spurſtow, Miniſter of *Hackney.*
La. Seaman, Paſtor of *Alh. Breadſtreet.*
Sim. Aſhe, Miniſter of *Michael Baſingſhaw.*
Tho. Caſe, Miniſter of *Magd. Milkſtreet.*
Nich. Proffet, Miniſter of *Foſters.*
Tho. Thorowgood, Miniſter of *Crayford.*
Edward Corbet, Miniſter of *Croyden.*
H. Roborough, Paſtor of *Leonards Eaſtcheap.*
Arth. Jackſon, Paſtor of *Mich. Woodſtreet.*
Ja. Nalton, Paſtor of *Leonards Foſterlane.*
Tho. Cawton, Paſtor of *Barthol. Exchange.*
Charles Offspring, Paſtor of *Antholins.*
Sa. Clark, Miniſter of *Bennet Fynk.*
Jo. Wall, Miniſter of *Michael Cornhill.*
Fr. Roberts, Paſtor at *Auſtins.*
Mat. Haviland, Paſtor of *Trinity.*
John Sheffield, Miniſter of *Swithins.*
Will. Harriſon, Miniſter of *Gracechurch.*
Will. Jenkyn, Miniſter of *Chriſtchurch.*
John Viner, Paſtor of *Botolph Aldgate.*
Elid. Blackwel, Paſtor of *Andr. Underſhaft.*
Joh. Croſſe, Miniſter at *Math. Fridayſtreet.*
Joh. Fuller, Miniſter at *Botolph Biſhopſgate.*
W. Taylor, Paſtor of *Stephens Colemanſtreet.*
Pet. Witham, Paſtor of *Albans Woodſtreet.*
Fran. Peck, Paſtor of *Nich. Acorne.*
Chriſtoph. Love, Paſtor of *Anne Alderſgate.*
J. Wallis, Miniſt. of *Martin Ironmongerlane.*
Tho. Watſon, Paſtor of *Stephens Walbrook.*
Tho. Bedford, Paſtor of *Martins Outwich.*
W. Wickins, Paſtor of *Andrew Hubbard.*
Tho. Manton, Miniſter of *Stoke Newington.*
Tho. Gouge, Paſtor of *Sepulchres.*
W. Blackmore, Paſtor of *Peters Cornhil.*
Robert Mercer, Miniſter of *Brides.*
Ra. Robinſon, Paſtor of *Mary Woolnoth.*
John Glaſcock, Miniſter at *Underſhaft.*
Tho. Whately, Miniſter at *Mary Woolchurch.*
Jon. Lloyd, Paſtor of *James Garlick-Hithe.*
John Wells, Paſtor of *Olaves Jury.*
Benj. Needler, Paſtor of *Margaret Moſes.*
Nath. Staniforth, Miniſter of *Mary Bothaw.*
Steph. Watkins, Miniſter of *Mary Overies.*
Jacob Tice, Paſtor of *Botolph Billingſgate.*
John Stileman, Miniſter at *Rotherhithe.*
Joſias Bull, Paſtor of *North Cray.*
J. Devereux, late Miniſter at *Andr. Holborn.*
Paul Ruſſel, Preacher at *Hackney.*
Joſuah Kirby, Miniſter of the Word.
Arthur Barham, Paſtor at *Helens.*

POSTSCRIPT, *being a Vindication of Two Paſſages in* the Rights of Proteſtant Diſſenters: *In anſwer to a* POSTSCRIPT *to a ſecond Letter to the Author of the* three Letters for Toleration, *from the Author of the Argument of the Letter concerning Toleration, briefly conſider'd and anſwer'd, and of the Defence of it.*

HE who writes for a Toleration, muſt neither be angry nor ſurpriz'd, that others make their Remarks as freely and as publickly upon what he has ſaid for it, as he did his upon what others have ſaid againſt it. And tho any Objections are very welcome to our Author, which will but help him to the Truth, or give him an Opportunity to clear it to others; yet he muſt needs own, he was a little *ſtartl'd* at the way and manner in which they were made by the Author of this Poſtſcript.

He was ſurpriz'd to ſee any notice taken of 'the Rights of Pro-'teſtant Diſſenters,' at the end of a very *ſhort Anſwer* to the 'third 'Letter for Toleration.' In which, every thing had been very largely and accurately anſwer'd, that the Author of the Poſtſcript had craftily urg'd, in the Argument 'of the Letter concerning Toleration, brief-'ly conſider'd and anſwer'd, and in the Defence of it;' againſt an Abſolute and Impartial Toleration, and in behalf of his own Scheme of Perſecution. A Letter which the World thought deſerv'd another Anſwer, than 'a brief Specimen of its Anſwerableneſs,' as the ſecond Letter is pleas'd to call it; and to another end, than to convince the World, that 'the Character of the Clergy' had done him a great deal of Injury, in aſſuring us, as it ſeems without any manner of ground for it, that upon farther Reflection, he had put on more Humanity and good Nature than he cou'd formerly be accus'd of. Since he was reſolv'd to ſpend but three Sheets in anſwering fifty, wherein the moſt critical Reader will hardly find a Line that is not clear, cogent, and to the purpoſe, he might very well have allow'd this ſmall Pittance to that incomparable Letter, without waſting any part of it upon 'the Rights of Proteſtant Diſſenters.' That Letter, I may venture to aſſure him, has made ſuch deep Impreſſions, that till he can ſucceed in helping the World to wear 'em out, better than he has, in this laſt Attempt, to get rid of any of 'em, he might in the Opinion of very judicious Perſons, have quietly lain under the Report of 'the Character of the Clergy,' without having done himſelf any Injury.

A ſecond Letter to the Author of the 3 Letters for Toleration, &c. p. 1, 2.

Our Author was yet the more startl'd to find himself attack'd by one, that seems very desirous to be thought *shy of Controversy*. When our Author found him (like a Man quite tir'd of Writing) end his Letter, by telling the Author of 'the third Letter for Toleration,' that 'he can spend his time better than in unravelling Cobwebs, and 'detecting Sophistry,' tho he had only endeavour'd to unravel a very small part of the Web that judicious Author had spun: Our Author was not a little surpriz'd to find him immediately vouchsafing to unravel some Threds of a new one. If he had had another hour to have flung away upon things of so little Consequence, it had certainly been better employ'd in unravelling a Cobweb, which had caught a great many well-meaning People, that want his Assistance to disentangle 'em; and which was said to have caught as wise an Animal as himself; than in entring upon one, which was not upon any account so likely, either to ensnare others, or to give Occasion for raising a Report so groundless and injurious to him.

A second Letter, p. 19.

Our Author was yet most of all surpriz'd, to find the notice that was taken of 'the Rights of Protestant Dissenters,' *address'd* to the Author of 'the three Letters for Toleration;' who is no ways concern'd, nor can't be any ways affected by it; nor ought in any Propriety to have been troubl'd with its Absurditys, tho they were as great as the Postscript wou'd make 'em. Two of those three Letters were written for an Universal and Absolute Toleration of Mankind, against the Scheme of a Man of Speculation, and of the Schools. 'The Rights of Protestant Dissenters' was written against the Scheme of a Statesman and a Man of Business, and pleads no other ways for an Universal and Absolute Toleration, than as it serves to strengthen the Plea for the Universal and Absolute Toleration of Protestant Dissenters. So that the Author of 'the three 'Letters for Toleration' wrote against a different Plan of Persecution, manag'd by a different Hand, and with another View than the Author of 'the Rights of Protestant Dissenters:' And therefore no Faults in his arguing against the Scheme he opposes, can any ways affect a Man, that writes to a different purpose against another.

Indeed the Postscript is pleas'd to call our Author a *Disciple* of the Author of 'the three Letters for Toleration'; and 'tis not unlikely, that it was this suppos'd Relation that rais'd his Spleen, and provok'd him to draw his Pen against our Author, in hopes to wound that extraordinary Person thro his sides. Indeed the Writer of the Postscript must think a Man very little acquainted with Books, that shou'd not have met with those incomparable Letters, which have been so much the Entertainment and Conversation of thinking Men. And he must suppose him less a Judg of 'em, who when he writes upon that Subject, shou'd not take a great many Notions from them;

and

and perhaps the Occasion of most, that have occur'd to him upon that Head. That Author's Thoughts appear to be too accurate and comprehensive, to miss any thing considerable, that ought to be said upon the Subject, or to leave much room for Alterations. And if by calling our Author his Disciple, he means no more, than that he argues from such Principles, as our Author believes to be the general Principles of Toleration, laid down in those Letters, and that he accommodates 'em to the Case of the Occasional Conformists, when he talks about a Toleration; 'tis a Character he has own'd to the World already, and which he thanks the Writer of the Postscript for, and is proud of.

The Rights of Protestant Dissenters Part 1. Pref. p. 20.

But then 'tis Truth he learns and submits to, and not to the Opinions of 'the Letters for Toleration'. And that the Writer of the Postscript may be satisfy'd of this, our Author assures him, he will as willingly learn any Truth from the Letters against Toleration, as from the Letters that were written for it: And he must desire the Writer of the Postscript to be assur'd, that in every case, as well as in this, he submits his Understanding to nothing but *Truth*, and calls no Man Teacher, but him, that came from God, and is the Truth it self. To submit it to any one else, may probably be a Homage, which the Writer of the Postscript pays to 'his Aristotle', and which he has taught some others possibly to pay to him: But which our Author thinks an Usurpation of the Authority of that great Prophet, for any body to challenge, and assume; and too abject a piece of Slavery for a Man to submit to, upon any Terms whatsoever.

A second Letter, p. 11.

And if this be his notion of our Author's Discipleship, as one wou'd think it is, by the Definition he seems to give of it, when he says, 'How blindly soever he may have submitted his Understanding to 'the Conduct of the Author of the three Letters for Toleration; as I told him just before, that he mistook the Scholar, so I must remind him now, that he as much mistakes the *Master*. For the Master is not capable of such a Scholar, no more than the Scholar cou'd bear such a Master. And Blindness will be but an odd Qualification of any one, that is to receive the Opinions laid down in those Letters, which can only be seen by the Evidence and Light of Truth. The admirable Author of 'em dictates nothing, and commands our belief of nothing; but brings Evidence for what he asserts, and then appeals to the Reason of his Reader, as his Judg. And none can receive his Evidence whose Prepossessions have stop'd his Ears, and have shut out those Arguments, which are to make their own way, and command the Readers assent. If they can't do it, he wou'd not have him yield it, tho he were to gain the World by the Bargain. And indeed he not only dissuades Men from giving up their Understanding to any thing but just Convictions; but has done more to prevent their submitting it to any thing else, and to prevent their being forc'd to pretend and profess to submit it when they really don't, than his and our Author's Adversary will ever be

Ib. p. 24.

able

able to overthrow, notwithſtanding all his Efforts to deprive 'em of this Inſtance of their Freedom, which is as infinitely preferable to all others, as the Concerns of the next Life are to this, and to introduce the worſt of Slavery in its Room. A State in which he ſuppoſes our Author to be, and in which he wiſhes he may be forc'd to continue, only with this Circumſtance, which muſt make his Chains the heavier, that he may not have the Liberty, when he quits Reaſon, to chuſe his own Maſter. 'Tis but therefore a put-on-Anger of the Writer of the Poſtſcript, when he reproaches him for ſubmitting his Underſtanding blindly to another; for that this Writer pleads for, and can't be diſpleas'd with. All that incenſes him muſt be, that our Author has not blindly ſubmitted it to a Guide, that he approves of.

I hope I ſhall be pardon'd for a little Digreſſion, if I take notice upon this Occaſion, that this is not the only Inſtance, in which this Writer ſeems to have given his own Character, when he pretends to give that of our Author. Poſſibly he wou'd be willingly thought the Patron of thoſe that ſet up for plaguing other Men; and deſerves the Poſt, for ought I know, as well as any body that wou'd put in for it. It would be as much below a Patron, to oppoſe any thing leſs than a Patron, as it wou'd be below a Don Quixot, to fight with any thing under a Knight. The Author of the Poſtſcript being perhaps, deſirous to be taken for the Patron of thoſe who wou'd force all Men to conform, muſt needs make his Adverſary 'the *Patron* of 'thoſe that diſſent'. I know of no other Reaſon, that cou'd induce him to beſtow this Title upon our Author, if by it he wou'd give the World to underſtand, that our Author is not only the Patron of a Cauſe, but of a Party. Whereas, as he is far from thinking himſelf to deſerve this Title in the firſt Senſe; ſo he deteſts it in the latter. If he has pleaded the Cauſe of the Diſſenters, 'tis as they are honeſt Men, and good Chriſtians, whom others wou'd oppreſs and injure: But he wou'd become the Patron of Churchmen, or of any others, cou'd they be ſuppos'd to want his Patronage, or were he capable of giving it, as they come under any of theſe Conſiderations: And he'l be far from endeavouring to plead the Cauſe of the Diſſenters, as they come under any other. He owes his beſt Endeavours to protect all honeſt and injur'd Men, by the Law of Nature; and he owes as much to all Chriſtians, by the Law of Faith: But he never link'd himſelf to any Community of Men, but under one of theſe Notions. If any Communitys come under any other, and are united in any deſign, but the enjoying and protecting the Rights of Humanity, and the Chriſtian Religion, they become Partys and Confederacys, which he declares to all the World he has nothing to do with. Nay he wou'd be ſo far from ſerving any of their little baſe Intereſts, that he owns, he longs for nothing more, than to ſee 'em all deſtroy'd. For he

A ſecond Letter, p. 24.

he thinks their Intereſt to be as oppoſite to the Intereſt of Societys of honeſt Men, and good Chriſtians, as the Spirit of Chriſt is to that of Antichriſt.

But to return: Tho this ſuppos'd Relation between the Author of 'the three Letters for Toleration' and 'the Rights of Proteſtant 'Diſſenters,' could not well raiſe the Writer of the Poſtſcript's Choler, unleſs it happen'd to be near boiling over, yet this ſeems to have been the Caſe. The Author of thoſe Letters deſerv'd a Grudg for writing ſuch, as admitted of no Anſwer but a 'Specimen of their 'Anſwerableneſs'; and for laying down Principles, that would ſerve to patronize thoſe pernicious hated Men, the worſt of all Diſſenters, the Occaſional Conformiſts, when apply'd to their Caſe. Such Uſage as this one muſt own was enough to raiſe his Spleen, and poſſibly it was thought more proper to vent it upon our Author, than upon the other. Perhaps 'the Rights of Proteſtant Diſſenters' was found to ly a little more open than the Letters which incens'd him. And the Author of the Poſtſcript, like an angry Man, finding thoſe that rais'd his Paſſion out of his reach, ſtrikes him that is next him. His Anger ſeems entirely to have got the better of him; and like a Man wild with Rage and Fury, he flings about him without any Reſtraint or Aim. He wou'd inſinuate, that thoſe incomparable Letters, which are very full of a moſt Chriſtian Spirit, wou'd have engag'd our Author in the moſt *Impious Enterprize* imaginable, if he wou'd have given up himſelf to their Inſtructions. For he ſays, 'How blindly ſoever our 'Author may have ſubmitted his Underſtanding to the others Con- 'duct, He ſuppoſes our Author will not undertake to ſhew, 'that it is one of the Privileges (or Rights) of thoſe Saints to af- 'front, inſult and outrage the great God of Heaven and Earth, to 'qualify themſelves for Places of Power and Profit.' How he came, among all the deſpicable Thoughts he entertains of our Author, to think his blindneſs not ſo great, as to ſuffer him to follow any Leader into ſuch Bogs and Precipices as theſe, I know not. Nor how he came to blend this Charity for him, with a moſt unaccountable Inſinuation againſt the Author of 'the three Letters for Toleration'; whoſe Conduct, he thinks, wou'd have led our Author into 'em, for the ſake of theſe Saints, if he had given up himſelf entirely to that Author's Guidance. But it ſeems to be a Rant, into which the Writer of the Poſtſcript had wound up himſelf, and in which he expires, and therefore won't bear too nice an Examination. Our Author can't in the mean while forbear to ſay, that if his Miſmanagements or Miſapplications of any of the generous Principles laid down in thoſe Letters, may have drawn this unhandſom Uſage upon their Author, he is heartily ſorry for it: Or if he has had this unjuſt notice taken of him, only upon the account of thoſe three Letters, he's ſo far from pitying himſelf, that he would willingly endure much worſe Uſage for a fourth.

A ſecond Letter, p. 24.

But

But they will perhaps be the more ready to believe, that 'tis the latter of these Reasons that gave occasion to this Postscript, who consider, upon what account the Author of it falls upon the 'Rights of Protestant 'Dissenters': 'Tis *for two Passages*. One wou'd think then they were Passages, upon which the whole Controversy about tolerating Occasional Conformity depended; since that Author has broke in upon so many Rules of Propriety, and his own Inclinations to make his Remarks upon 'em. But if we will take a short view of the Controversy, we shall see that both his Remarks are so trifling, that if they were just, they cou'd not any ways prejudice the Cause of Occasional Conformity; nor cou'd reach any farther than to expose our Author's Management of it. He wrote with a design to defend the Toleration of Occasional Conformists. To clear his way, he acts the Historian, and gives an account of what he takes to be the Principles of the Dissenters Stated Dissent and Occasional Conformity. He then endeavours to prove, that whether the Reasons which the Occasional Conformists bring to defend their Practice, be just or no, they have a Right to a Toleration, and that 'tis the Interest of the Government to maintain it; and answers several Exceptions that may be made to their Plea for it, supposing the Occasional Conformists to be mistaken. It seems it appears to the Writer of the Postscript, that the Reasons of the Dissenters Stated Dissent and Occasional Conformity *are not consistent*, as they are laid down in 'the Rights of Protestant Dissenters.' Well, what if they are not? If the Author of the Postscript wrote the 'Re-'publique des Lettres,' or 'the History of the Works of the Learned, and wou'd make his History stoop so low, as to give the Character of 'the Rights of Protestant Dissenters,' he might have said, that one part of it was inconsistent with another. But will he, who knows so well the true worth of Time, take the pains to shew the Inconsistencys of every Pamphlet in every Letter he writes?

A second Letter, p. 22,23,24.

But it seems, besides this Absurdity, our Author is guilty of another. He makes two Replys to an Exception, which Sir H. M. may be suppos'd to bring against our Author's Plea for the Toleration of Occasional Conformists. Each of these Answers is a sufficient Reply to the Exception, and is independent upon the other. But it shou'd seem that one of these Answers contains an *inconsequent* Conclusion. Well if it does, is this worth the Writer of the Postscript's while, to trouble himself, and the Author of the 'three Letters for Tolerati-'on' withal? Is any valuable purpose serv'd by it? Is any considerable Truth clear'd by it? Or does it follow that the Occasional Conformists ought not to be tolerated? That Question sure can't be in the least affected by either of these Criticisms, tho both of 'em were well grounded. And if he only design'd them as a Reflection upon the 'Rights of Protestant Dissenters,' methinks it discovers a great deal of fondness of Controversy, for a Man, that in another Instance is

as

as deſirous to avoid it; and one wou'd think, he had no other way to employ his time, whatever price he may ſeem to put upon it, than to 'unravel Cobwebs, and detect Sophiſtry.

If he thought by this means to beget a *Prejudice* againſt the 'Rights 'of Proteſtant Diſſenters,' and like an over-officious Phyſician, to preſcribe an Antidote of little Virtue to expel a Poiſon, which 'twas his Intereſt to exclaim againſt as Mortal, tho 'twas not worth the taking notice of, that ſo his Antidote might be thought the more neceſſary, he ſeems to have made but a very ill Judgment of the matter. For as any one that underſtood the Weakneſs of the Antidote, wou'd preſently conclude that the Poiſon was not ſo ſtrong as was pretended; ſo it will be no very unnatural Concluſion, that 'the Rights of Pro-'teſtant Diſſenters' has ſomething elſe beſides Inconſequences and Contradictions, ſince a Man ſo deſirous to find out its Faults, and to publiſh 'em to the World, has taken notice but of two.

The Criticiſms he makes upon 'em at the ſame time, not being ſuch as will help us at all in our main Enquiry; they had not receiv'd this Anſwer, and much leſs ſo large an one, if our Author had not thought it proper, that this *Juſtice* ſhou'd be done to the Author of 'the 'Letters for Toleration,' rather than to himſelf: And if the Bookſeller had not given ſo fair an *Opportunity* for diſcharging this juſt Debt to that great Man's memory, by giving our Author notice of a ſecond Edition, and deſiring him, that any Additions or Amendments might be prepar'd, which were deſign'd for that Impreſſion.

The firſt Paſſage the Poſtſcript is pleas'd to take notice of, is one quoted from the 51ſt page of 'the Rights of Proteſtant Diſſen-'ters,' viz. 'If Deprivations and Incapacitys wou'd diſpoſe the Diſ-'ſenters to be convinc'd, and were proper to that end, then all the 'Penal Laws are much more ſo, and ought to ſtand in full force a-'gainſt 'em: For if Hardſhips are proper to that end, the greater 'they are, the more likely are they to be effectual.' This Paſſage contains two Propoſitions, the former of them is founded on the latter, which is this general one, 'That if Hardſhips are proper to diſpoſe 'the Diſſenters to be convinc'd, the greater they are, the more likely 'are they to be effectual': which the Poſtſcript ſays is no juſt Conſequence. Now it were eaſy to confirm the Truth and Conſequence of this general Propoſition, from the general *Notions of Means and Ends*; and particularly from this Axiom, upon which this Propoſition is founded, and which will eaſily appear to hold conſtantly true, to any one, who duly conſiders the Relation that Ends and Means bear to one another: 'That whatſoever Means have a 'proper Cauſality for attaining any End, the more of the Efficacy 'of thoſe Means is exerted, the more compleatly will the End be at-'tain'd.' Thus Faith giving us the Victory over the World, the ſtronger our Faith is, the greater will be the Victory: And Pati-

ence giving us the possession of our Souls, the more Patience we have the more undisturb'd will be our Possession. And upon the same account, Hardships being suppos'd to be proper to dispose the Dissenters for Conviction, the greater they are, the stronger will be their Convictions; or in other words, the more likely are they to be effectual.

But not to pursue metaphysical and abstracted Thoughts any farther for the proof of this Proposition; let us consult *Experience*, which in a matter of this Nature is chiefly to be regarded. That informs us, that the Dissenters are now actually depriv'd of a great many of the Places of Honor and Profit, which they have sometimes held. And as our Author says, 'their Distance from the Church has nothing attending it but Reproach and Difficulty, besides the Satisfaction of their own Mind; for by it they are precluded in a manner from Usefulness, Honour and Preferment.' Has this convinc'd them who are depriv'd of their Places, or has it dispos'd 'em for Conviction? Farther, are not those Dissenters who can't conform upon any Occasion, incapacitated for all Places, by the Corporation and Test Acts? But have these Deprivations and Incapacity's dispos'd them for Conviction? Nay, have they not stood the severer Persecutions of some late Reigns, rais'd upon them by virtue of all the Penal Laws, some of which banish'd 'em their Habitations, others their Country; some took away their Estates, and all of them struck at their Reputation? But did all these Hardships dispose 'em at all for Conviction? If they han't, then either Hardships are not proper to dispose 'em to be convinc'd: Or if they are, they must be greater Hardships than any they have yet lain under. And then I think Experience sufficiently confirms the Truth of this Proposition, that if Hardships are proper to dispose the Dissenters to be convinc'd, the greater they are, the more likely are they to be effectual.

Rights of Protestant Dissenters, p. 53.

But whether this Proposition were true or no consider'd in it self, yet it will appear to be true, according to Sir H.M's *Scheme*, which was the Scheme that the 'Rights of Protestant Dissenters' oppos'd. That Scheme stands thus. The Dissenters are to be dispos'd to be convinc'd by a Bill, which is to deal with them in a way that is somewhat different from Love and Kindness, and the gentle Methods of Reason, Arguments and a good Example. This way of dealing with 'em may, I think, be fairly comprehended under the general Term of Hardships. These Hardships are, according to Sir H. either to convince the Dissenters, or to dispose 'em to be convinc'd. He does not know well which of these two 'tis to do. An Uncertainty, which tho he is often guilty of, one wou'd think he cou'd hardly have fallen into here; since 'tis pretty odd to imagin, that what was proper to convince the Dissenters, shou'd be thought proper to dispose 'em for Conviction. He does not tell us how these Hardships are to convince;

but

but he thinks they may diſpoſe the Diſſenters for Conviction, by making 'em wiſh for a Reconciliation with the Church, and in conſequence of thoſe Wiſhes, to enquire into its Nature and Excellency, till they are not occaſionally, but totally and uninterruptedly reconcil'd to it. That is to ſay, when the Scheme is freed from its Ambiguity and Circumlocution, and put into plain Engliſh, that the Diſſenters are by Hardſhips to be brought to conform to the Polity, Ceremonys, and Diſcipline of the Eſtabliſh'd Church. That this is his Scheme appears from his Preface. I ſhan't ſtand to prove it to be his Scheme here, that being done to our hand. However, that I might not do this Scheme any Injuſtice, I have endeavour'd, in laying its parts together, to keep as cloſe to Sir H's Expreſſions as I cou'd. Now our Author writing againſt Hardſhips that are to operate in this manner, might juſtly ſay, the greater they were the more likely were they to be effectual; ſince it is certain, that the greater the Hardſhips are, till they come to ſuch a degree as wou'd prevent the Diſſenters Wiſhes and Enquirys or ſo much as their outward Conformity, the more earneſtly muſt they make the Diſſenters wiſh for a Reconciliation with the Church; and muſt conſequently, according to this Scheme, put them upon narrower Enquirys into its Nature and Excellency's, and ſo diſpoſe them the more effectually for Conviction. *Rights of Proteſtant Diſſenters, P.* 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56.

Thus greater Hardſhips appear more likely to be effectual towards begetting a Diſpoſition in the Diſſenters to be convinc'd than leſſer ones, according to Sir H's pretended Scheme; but they will yet appear more likely to be effectual according to his *real* one, which the pretended one does but diſguiſe and cover. For greater Hardſhips have, without all queſtion, a greater tendency in their own Nature, to make Men outwardly conform to the Polity, Ceremonys and Diſcipline of the Eſtabliſh'd Church, than leſſer ones: Becauſe they beget a greater Uneaſineſs, and conſequently a greater deſire to get rid of it. And outward Conformity being the way to get rid of that Uneaſineſs, greater Hardſhips have a greater tendency in their own Nature, to make the Diſſenters outwardly conform, than leſſer ones.

Thus the Truth of this Propoſition appears to follow ſo plainly from Sir H's Scheme, ſuppoſing it to be juſt, that if the Writer of the Poſtſcript had not been *afraid*, that his own Scheme of Perſecution had been attack'd, I think how deſirous ſoever he might be to fall upon our Author, he wou'd never have done it for the want of Connexion between the Parts of this Propoſition. Whereas if the Writer of the Poſtſcript had not been too ſtand and full of his own Scheme, he muſt needs have ſeen that Sir H's differs from his, and that therefore it could not be his that was here oppos'd. For Sir H. like a Gentleman of more Candor and leſs Art, has told us, that his Scheme is to make the Diſſenters uneaſy, that ſo they may wiſh for a Reconciliation

ciliation with the Church; and from thence be brought to enquire into its Excellency in order to be reconcil'd to it: And has given us a very fair hint, that he means nothing more by all this, than to punish Dissenters to make 'em conform. From whence it follows by a very near Connexion, that the heavier the Penaltys, the more likely are they to attain their end. And therefore our Author thought no Argument more proper to shew that these Deprivations and Incapacitys ought not to be brought upon the Dissenters in order to dispose them for Conviction, than to shew, that if the Dissenters ought to be thus depriv'd and incapacitated for that end, this Consequence wou'd follow from it, that all the penal Laws ought to stand in full Force against them: Because that if Hardships were proper to that end, then the greater they were the more likely were they to be effectual. Our Author thought this Consequence wou'd be a sufficient absurdity to load this Scheme with, and cou'd not fail to sink its Credit, now that the Toleration is become a fundamental Maxim of our Government, and an essential part of the Constitution.

But the Writer of the Postscript, like a more wary Man, has run into thicker Cover, that he might hide himself the better, and give his Adversary the more trouble to beat him out. His Scheme, when 'tis put the fairest, stands thus. Moderate Penaltys are to be inflicted upon Dissenters, to put 'em upon enquiry into the nature of the Church, and of their Dissent from it, and to make 'em lay aside the Prejudices, which wou'd render their Enquirys useless; and so Punishments are thus indirectly and at a distance to bring men to Conform. Now tho this Scheme will upon a little Consideration appear to be the same with the other, as 'the Letters for Toleration' have plainly prov'd; yet it must be first made to appear to be the same by a train of Consequences, before it can be justly loaded with the same Absurdity, which 'the 'Rights of Protestant Dissenters' has prov'd to follow from the other. So that if this Passage had been brought in the very same manner, against the Scheme which the Writer of the Postscript has laid down in his Letters concerning Toleration, as it is against Sir H's, there had been some better pretence for his taking this notice of it. And possibly it was his *mistaken* Opinion, that this Passage was design'd against him, that must account for it among other things; since without this mistake, I can't see, that the notice he has taken of these Passages can have proceded from any thing but a pique which he had against the Author of 'the Letters for Toleration'; which I wou'd willingly excuse him from, as much as I cou'd.

This General Proposition appearing to be true consider'd in it self, and the Reference it bears to the place where it stands, and the design with which it was written; there's no need that any thing more be said to prove the Truth of the *former* Proposition, that depends upon it, and is included in it, viz. 'That if Deprivations and Incapacitys

'wou'd

'wou'd diſpoſe the Diſſenters to be convinc'd, and were proper to that 'End; then all the penal Laws were much more ſo, and ought to ſtand 'in full Force againſt 'em': unleſs any one ſhou'd think fit to aſſert, that all the penal Laws wou'd not bring greater Hardſhips upon the Diſſenters than bare Deprivations and Incapacitys. I hope the World will give me leave to call 'em ſo, till the Writer of the Poſtſcript has prov'd, 'Incapacitations,' which he wou'd have ſubſtituted in the room of 'Incapacitys', to be an Engliſh word; and that *Incapacitys*, which he finds fault with, is not one; and has not the ſame Idea annext to it, which he thinks can be only tack'd to the uncouth word he makes uſe of. For Incapacitys in our common Phraſeology does not only denote the want of a Capacity, but the taking it away: Or if you will, it does not only denote a want of a Natural, but the taking away of a Legal Capacity by a Law made to remove it. However our Author will take care to put it out of his power to make this Cavil for the future: And when he has occaſion to make uſe of this word, he will add 'Legal' to it, that there may be no opportunity for a Critick to miſtake his meaning.

The Author of the Poſtſcript has not chang'd his Character, nor forgot to act the 'man of Art.' He has play'd the Grammarian to eke out ſome ſcanty Criticiſms in Logick; and when he found plain Reaſons wanting to prove his Remarks, and to overthrow the Connexion that there is between the parts of each Propoſition, and the Relation each of them bears to one another, he has only brought a Couple of *Similitudes* to argue their Abſurdity, and to ridicule 'em. Similitudes ſerve very well to illuſtrate and explain; and convey our meaning more lively, and impreſs it more ſtrongly than any form of expreſſion whatſoever. But when they are us'd as ſingle Arguments, and are ſupported by no other Syllogiſms and Demonſtrations, they ſeldom prove any thing more, than that he who uſes 'em does not underſtand diſtinctly the thing they are brought to prove. For if he did, might he not better prove the Queſtion in diſpute from the nature of the thing it ſelf, than from the nature of another thing, which is ſuppos'd to be like it? Eſpecially ſince there is more danger, conſidering the defects of our Underſtanding, that a man ſhou'd not know two things, than that he ſhou'd know one. Whereas if he does not equally underſtand both the thing he talks of, and that which he compares it to, 'tis by chance if his Compariſon does not lead him into a miſtake.

And we ſhall find, upon a little Examination, that this has been the caſe of the Author of the Poſtſcript, whoſe Similitudes ſerve no purpoſe, but to miſlead others; and to give his Anſwerer the trouble to ſhew, that they don't ſerve that purpoſe, for which they are brought. This I ſhou'd be the *better* able to do, if he had told me, how he ſuppoſes Opium to operate towards diſpoſing ſome ſick People for their Recovery, and how moderate and ſeaſonable Showers make the Earth fruitful, as clearly

clearly as Sir H. M. has inform'd us, how Penaltys are to diſpoſe the Diſſenters to be convinc'd. If he had done this, I might very poſſibly have convinc'd him out of his own Mouth of the difference of theſe Caſes. But the Author of the Poſtſcript's Art and Caution is here again to be admir'd, who has not only made uſe of a Couple of Similitudes, the moſt fallacious of all ways of arguing; but has choſen ſuch, whoſe diſparity we cou'd not ſo eaſily prove, by reaſon of our Ignorance of the myſterious manner by which Opium operates, and Showers impregnate the Earth. But tho he has not given me this Advantage, yet it will be no very difficult thing to convince every unbiaſs'd Perſon of the diverſity of both his Compariſons without it. It ſo falls out, that Caſes, which ſeem at the firſt view to bear ſome proportion, cou'd not poſſibly be more different.

A ſecond Letter, p. 21, 22.

He firſt obſerves that when our Author ſays, 'that if Deprivations 'and Incapacitys wou'd diſpoſe the Diſſenters to be convinc'd, and 'were proper for that end; then all the Penal Laws are much more ſo, 'and ought to ſtand in full force againſt 'em: Becauſe that if Hardſhips were proper to that end, the greater they were, the more likely 'were they to be effectual.' He obſerves, I ſay, 'that when our Author 'ſays this, he diſcourſes juſt as wiſely and ſtrongly as he that ſhou'd ſay; 'if a Doſe of two Grains of Opium will diſpoſe ſome ſick Perſons for the 'recovery of their Health, and is proper for that end; then thoſe Perſons 'ought to take all the Opium, and other Narcoticks that they can get. 'For if Narcoticks are proper to that end, the more they take of them 'the more likely are they to be effectual. And he adds, that by the 'like diſcourſe, any one that has a mind to it may prove, that a 'perpetual Deluge wou'd make the Earth more fruitful than moderate 'and ſeaſonable Showers; and a hundred ſuch things beſides. The Diſcourſe in 'the Rights of Proteſtant Diſſenters' is ſo different from this, that I think the Author of the Poſtſcript cou'd no ways have expos'd his own weakneſs more than by *comparing* them. For in the firſt caſe, two grains of Opium are ſuppos'd to be ſufficient means to diſpoſe ſome ſick Perſons for the Recovery of their Health; and ſince it is only ſuch a quantity of Narcoticks that is ſuppos'd proper to that end, Narcoticks, as they ſignify an indefinite quantity, can't be ſaid to be proper to that end. And in the other caſe, a Deluge has no tendency to make the Earth fruitful. Whereas Hardſhips are ſuppos'd by Sir H. M. to have a tendency to diſpoſe the Diſſenters to be convinc'd; and are ſuppos'd to have this tendency as Hardſhips. For he has ſet no bounds to the Hardſhips that are to beget this Diſpoſition, but makes Deprivations and legal Incapacitys, conſider'd as ſomething that's contrary to Love and Kindneſs, and the gentle methods of Reaſons, Arguments and a good Example, that is to ſay Hardſhips as Hardſhips, proper and likely to produce this effect. As we have prov'd before, both

by

by the whole frame of Sir H's Scheme, and ſome particular Expreſſions which he makes uſe of.

Sir *H.* has never ſo much as pretended, that the Hardſhips he ſpeaks of, are to produce this Diſpoſition as moderate Hardſhips, but as Hardſhips. Nor indeed cou'd he ſet any bounds to them. And tho the Author of the Poſtſcript has talk'd of *moderate* Penaltys, which is what I ſuppoſe he wou'd compare with two grains of Opium, and moderate and ſeaſonable Showers (tho this Compariſon is not at all pertinent to the Paſſage he takes notice of) yet he cou'd never be brought to define his moderate Penaltys, tho call'd upon ſo often to do it. Nor can he ever comply with this demand, and tell us preciſely what moderate Penaltys mean. The moſt he can ſay is, that they are ſuch as will attain their end when they are apply'd, and will make men impartially conſider. But then the queſtion will ſtill return, What are thoſe Penaltys, that will make men impartially conſider? If he does not know till the Effect is produc'd, and muſt apply Penaltys till men conſider impartially; he may be forc'd to regulate his Penaltys by our Author's diſcourſe, as ridiculous as he wou'd make it appear to be, and inflict the ſevereſt Penaltys to make men impartially conſider if lighter Penaltys wou'd not reach that End. Juſt as, to borrow his Compariſon, and to uſe it with more Juſtice; if Opium moderately taken was the only remedy that cou'd diſpoſe ſome ſick Perſons for the recovery of their Health; and he meant nothing by a moderate quantity of Opium, but what wou'd diſpoſe 'em for Recovery; and he did not know what wou'd diſpoſe 'em for recovery till they were really recover'd; if leſſer quantitys wou'd not do, they muſt ſtop at no quantity of Opium and other Narcoticks they cou'd * get, that wou'd not infallibly kill. And ſo in the other caſe, if the Author of the Poſtſcript was the Father of the Drops, and had no other method to make the Earth fruitful than ſeaſonable and moderate Showers; and if by ſeaſonable and moderate Showers, he only meant Showers that wou'd make the Earth fruitful, and conſequently did not know when he had rain'd down ſeaſonable and moderate Showers till the Earth had produc'd her Fruits: Putting this to be the caſe, if ſmaller Showers wou'd not impregnate the Earth, he muſt come to greater; and ſtop at nothing but a perpetual Deluge.

Indeed he might know in both theſe Caſes, that ſuch a Doſe of Opium as wou'd infallibly kill, and Rains which wou'd perpetually drown the

---

* *Thus Dr. Sydenham tells us, it was his Practice,* 'augere doſin Laudani 'pro Doloris magnitudine; & doſin in tantum augere, donec tandem pervicaciſſima 'illa ſymptomata (ſcilicet Vomituritionis & Convulſionis) ſub jugum victoris mit-'teventur'; *and directs others to do the like. Tho. Sydenham,* 'Praxis Medica 'Experim. *p.* 262, 263.

Earth

Earth and all its Productions, were no likelier means to diſpoſe for Recovery or Fruitfulneſs, than to knock out mens Brains to make 'em conſider: And unleſs the Writer of the Poſtſcript cou'd ſuppoſe, what I think 'twas impoſſible for him to ſuppoſe, that our Author cou'd mean Hardſhips, that wou'd abſolutely prevent all Wiſhes, Enquirys, and outward Conformity, by 'the greater Hardſhips which he ſaid were the moſt 'likely to beget a Diſpoſition for Conviction,' he has but very unjuſtly compar'd the greater Hardſhips our Author ſpeaks of to ſuch a Doſe of Opium as wou'd infallibly kill, and ſuch Showers as wou'd produce a perpetual Deluge. For ſuppoſing the Compariſons of two grains of Opium and ſeaſonable and moderate Showers to be pertinent to the Paſſage taken notice of, which they can't by any means be allow'd to be, yet if it had the Face of a *juſt* one, it ought only to have compar'd our Author's greater Hardſhips (which are ſtill ſuppos'd to leave room for Wiſhes, Enquirys and outward Conformity, as appears from the Inſtances our Author gives of theſe greater Hardſhips) with ſuch a Doſe of Opium as wou'd not kill, and ſuch Showers as wou'd not perpetually drown.

Rights of Proteſtant Diſſenters, p. 54.

But farther, tho what Sir H. ſays of Hardſhips had been only ſaid of the moderate Hardſhips which the Author of the Poſtſcript has pleaded for, yet cou'd not Deprivations and legal Incapacitys be juſtly ſaid to be moderate Penaltys, in whatever ſenſe moderate Penaltys are taken. For they wou'd not be mild Penaltys to him, who by this Deprivation ſhou'd loſe a Place by which he got his Bread; and by the loſs of which he muſt Starve: Nor wou'd it be perhaps enough to make another man impartially conſider, or outwardly conform, who loſt but an Inconſiderable place by it, which he did not value. And ſince *Deprivations and Legal Incapacitys wou'd not be moderate Penaltys* in any Senſe, 'tis eaſily ſeen, how unjuſtly the Author of the Poſtſcript compares Deprivations and legal Incapacitys, under the notion of moderate Penaltys, with two grains of Opium and with ſeaſonable and moderate Showers. Whence it follows, that he who ſays, 'if Deprivations and Inca'pacitys are proper to diſpoſe the Diſſenters to be convinc'd, then grea'ter Hardſhips are more proper to that end', does not argue ſo weakly, as he who ſays, 'that from thence it follows, that if two grains of Opium 'are proper to diſpoſe ſome ſick Perſons for the recovery of their 'Health, therefore they muſt take all the Opium they can get; and 'that if ſeaſonable and moderate Showers produce fruitfulneſs, a perpe'tual Deluge will. For Deprivations and legal Incapacitys don't bear the ſame proportion towards begetting a diſpoſition in the Diſſenters to be convinc'd, that two grains of Opium do to beget a Diſpoſition in ſome ſick Perſons for recovering their Health, and that ſeaſonable and moderate Showers do to produce fruitfulneſs in the Earth. Both theſe Remedys for Sickneſs and Barrenneſs being ſuppos'd to be moderate Remedys; and Deprivations and legal Incapacitys being in no ſenſe moderate Penaltys.

And

Beſides, The Phyſician that adminiſters Opium, from his knowledg of the Rules of Phyſick, and the Indications of each Patient, knows what particular Doſe is proper, for this or that Perſon that is ſick; and if that Doſe will not do, he betakes himſelf to another Courſe. But if there was but one Phyſician in a Country, whoſe Province it was to preſcribe, and the Buſineſs of all others concern'd in Phyſick was to apply the Preſcriptions to particular Caſes, and to adminiſter the Medicine; and if Opium was the only Medicine preſcrib'd for ſuch a particular Diſeaſe, then he, whoſe Province it was to preſcribe, muſt order the Apothecarys to encreaſe the Doſes of Opium, till they came to ſuch as wou'd be infallibly mortal, if leſſer ones would not perform the Cure. And muſt not Lawgivers act in the ſame manner, who muſt preſcribe one ſort of Penaltys to all Diſſenters, and have no other remedy for their Indiſpoſition to be convinc'd; and who muſt leave it to the executive Power, to inflict thoſe Penaltys, not according as they ſhall ſee Occaſion, but purſuant to their Preſcriptions? Muſt not the Legiſlature, I ſay, order, that where leſſer Penaltys are not effectual they ſhou'd proceed to greater, and not ſtop till they come to ſuch as were inconſiſtent with Wiſhes, Enquirys or outward Conformity? And then I appeal to all Mankind, which reaſoning is beſt, our Author's, who ſaid, 'That if Deprivations and Incapacitys were 'proper to diſpoſe the Diſſenters to be convinc'd, then all the Penal 'Laws were much more ſo, and ought to ſtand in full force againſt 'them'; or the Poſtſcript's, which ſays, 'That he, who diſcourſes 'thus, diſcourſes as ſtrongly as he, that ſhou'd ſay, that if two grains 'of Opium were proper to diſpoſe ſome ſick Perſons, for the recovery 'of their Health, then they ought to take all the Opium, and the 'other Narcoticks they can get.

By this time I promiſe my ſelf, that every conſidering Reader will not only be induc'd to ſuppoſe, that a very great Diſparity wou'd appear between the Hardſhips, by which Lawgivers are to beget a Diſpoſition in Diſſenters to be convinc'd on the one hand, and two grains of Opium to diſpoſe ſome ſick Perſons, for the recovery of their Health, and moderate Showers to impregnate the Earth, on the other; were theſe two Caſes as well underſtood as the former: But that it will appear at the ſame time, that there can hardly be imagin'd a greater Diſparity between any two Caſes, that have the leaſt reſemblance. *Since the barren Earth, ſick People and Diſſenters; moderate Showers, two grains of Opium and Hardſhips; the Almighty Father of the Drops, Phyſicians, and Lawgivers, as they are here compar'd,* bear no proportion to one another. They that think me too tedious in ſhewing the Diverſity of theſe Caſes, will I hope forgive me, when they conſider, that he who writes againſt Similitudes and general Expreſſions, which have no determinate meaning, muſt, like a Man who

builds upon the Ruins of an old Foundation, spend as much time in clearing the Rubbish, as in raising the Pile.

The other Passage the Postscript takes notice of, is quoted from p. 25, 26. of 'the Rights of Protestant Dissenters', where speaking of the Worship due to God, and telling what the Dissenters Reasons of their stated Dissent amount to, our Author has these words. 'To give to God 'either what we think wou'd be unacceptable, or less acceptable than 'something else, that is in our Power to perform, wou'd be to offer 'him an Affront instead of Homage, and must procure his Resent-'ment instead of his Acceptance. And as not to worship God at 'all, is to turn Atheist, so not to worship him in that manner, 'which we think will please him best, is to become as much worse 'than an Atheist, as to outrage and insult the Deity is worse than 'to neglect it. Whence it follows, that whilst the Dissenters think, 'their Way of Worship more acceptable to God, than that esta-'blish'd by Law; 'tis impossible for 'em not to remain Dissenters, 'unless they'l turn Atheists, and not worship God at all; or Hypo-'crites, and not worship him, in that which they take to be the 'most acceptable manner.

A second Letter, p. 22, 23.

This is the Passage: and then the Author of the second Letter says, 'He cannot but observe, that if these be the Principles upon 'which the Dissenters pretend to justify their stated Dissent and 'Separation from the Church of England: If this be what the Dis-'senters Reasons amount to, as this Author expresly tells us it is; 'then their Principles and Reasons will oblige them, not to a stated 'Dissent only, but to a perpetual and never interrupted Dissent or 'Nonconformity. If they think the Worship of the Church of 'England less acceptable to God, than that which they give him 'in their separate Meetings; they can never by these Principles wor-'ship him with the Church of England, without offering him an 'Affront instead of Homage; nor without procuring his Re-'sentment instead of his Acceptance; nay, not without becoming 'as much worse than Atheists, as to outrage and insult the Deity 'is worse than to neglect it'.

Yes, *they may*, unless they think all the parts of the Worship of the Church of England, at all times less acceptable to God, than that which they give him in their separate Churches. And therefore till he proves, that they think so, which he never can, he infers very unreasonably from hence, 'that our Author must allow him to 'say, it follows, that whilst the Dissenters think their way of Wor-'ship more acceptable to God, than that establish'd by Law (as 'he supposes they always do) it is impossible for them ever, at any 'time, upon any Occasion whatsoever, to conform to that esta-'blish'd Worship, unless they will turn Hypocrites, and not worship

P. 24.

'him

'him, in that which they take to be the most acceptable manner; 'and so by their own Principles turn worse than Atheists, *&c.*

But our Author can by no means allow him to say this: Because he unjustly supposes, that those Dissenters of whom 'the Rights of Protestant Dissenters' is speaking, always think their way of Worship more acceptable to God, than some parts of that which is establish'd by Law. Indeed if they did, his Inference wou'd be just: But there is *enough* said in the 'Rights of Protestant Dissenters', to prove, that they don't. And the Reasons are there given, by which the Dissenters prove Conformity to some parts of the establish'd Worship, at sometimes to be more acceptable to God, than worshipping him in their separate Meetings. For it is there shewn, that their thinking thus, arises from such Principles, as they are said there to build upon that Article of our Belief, the Communion of Saints; upon Apostolical Examples, and the direct Tendencys it has to very valuable purposes. And enough is said to obviate the Contradiction, with which the Author of the Postscript wou'd load this Opinion; and the Opinion it self is vindicated from a pretended Inconsistency; and that Inconsistency is retorted upon a known Practice of the Church. So that how the Writer of the Postscript came to slip this over, and to think, that the Dissenters who are there spoken of, always believe it more acceptable, to worship God in their separate Churches, than sometimes in some parts of Worship of the establish'd Church, he himself can best tell.

Rights of Protestant Dissenters, p. 30, 32, 35.
P. 27. *in marg.*
P. 30, 31, 32.
P. 34, 35.

Nor cou'd he reasonably infer this from the Principles of their stated Dissent, tho he had only consider'd 'em abstractedly in themselves, and without giving himself the trouble to compare them with their Reasons of Occasional Conformity, to which he was refer'd, and which must have obviated this Difficulty, if he had fairly consider'd 'em. And to him let see, that he had no great reason to conclude, that the Dissenters think it always more acceptable, to worship God in their separate Churches, than to join sometimes in some parts of the establish'd Worship; because they think they must be Hypocrites or Atheists, not to remain Dissenters; I will but just *state the Case* of the Occasional Conformists. They think their separate Churches have some sacred Advantages, which are wanting in the National Church. And that therefore it is most acceptable to God, to join statedly in their Worship. They take the Church of England, to have some Corruptions, Defects, and unwarrantable Impositions in those things, in which they differ. They hold themselves therefore oblig'd to separate at all times from those Parts of Worship which are corrupt; and never to join so far in the other, as to encourage and abet its superfluous Impositions, or its Defects; which they think constant and total Conformity wou'd

P. 27. *in marg.*

Rights of Protestant Dissenters, P. 28, 29.

encourage and abet, and from which conſequently they ought to abſtain: But which they think Occaſional Conformity does not, and from which conſequently they are not oblig'd to abſtain. And therefore they think theſe Imperfections of the Church do not make it leſs acceptable to God to conform to the Church, than to ſeparate from it, in thoſe things in which they agree, and to an indifferent thing impos'd, upon thoſe Occaſions, when the ſacred Advantages of Conformity over-ballance thoſe of Separation. Since, as our Author ſaid, 'Conforming to an indifferent thing impos'd, does not encourage an impoſing Spirit in thoſe that enjoin it:' From which, together with a Stubbornneſs againſt amending ſinful Defects, and the Corruptions of the Church, they ought always to ſeparate.

P. 8, 13.

And that no body may think theſe Principles groundleſs and *fantaſtical*, I will only repeat what our Author ſaid upon this occaſion. That it is as conſiſtent and as reaſonable, to think it generally more acceptable to worſhip God in a Meeting, and ſometimes to join in ſome parts of the Worſhip of the Eſtabliſh'd Church; 'as for a Man, 'who liv'd in a Popiſh Country, to think it prudent and adviſable 'to eat Fleſh on a Wedneſday and Friday conſtantly at his own 'Houſe, and Fiſh ſometimes upon thoſe Days at his Neighbours: Or 'for a believing Corinthian, to hold it lawful to eat Meats offer'd to 'Idols, if it was not notify'd to him, that they had been offer'd to 'an Idol, and unlawful to eat 'em if it was. To this I will only add, that it is as conſiſtent and as reaſonable, as it wou'd have been to have given King Charles the Firſt any Sum of Mony for his private uſe in his Diſtreſs, if he had deſir'd it; and to have deny'd him any Levys of Mony demanded by his Officers, without Authority of Parliament, by force of Arms. Or, to paſs from a Civil to a Religious Inſtance; as it is to think it more acceptable to God to forgive an Injury if the injurious Man repents, and not to forgive him, if Forgiveneſs wou'd encourage his injurious Diſpoſitions. Or, as for St. Paul *, to think it more expedient to communicate ſtatedly with Societys of Chriſtian Gentiles, who had no Terms of Communion but the Terms of Salvation; and occaſionally with the converted Jews, in ſome parts of the Jewiſh Worſhip, namely, its unneceſſary Cere-

Rights of Proteſtant Diſſenters, p. 32.

---

* *See the Caſe of St. Paul's Occaſional Conformity ſtated, and prov'd to be parallel to the preſent Caſe of Occaſional Conformity, in a Pamphlet, entitl'd,* The Intereſt of England in reſpect to Proteſtant Diſſenters, with ſome Thoughts about Occational Conformity, *printed in the year* 1703. *from p.* 43. *of the ſecond Edition, uſque ad finem: which I hope the Author of 'the Letter 'to a Friend' will peruſe, becauſe I ſee he does not underſtand our Author's Notion about St. Paul's Occaſional Conformity, and St. Peter's Occaſional Non-conformity.*

monys

monys and Constitution, which were rigidly impos'd by the Governors of that Church. Or, to instance no more, why is it not altogether as consistent and as reasonable, as to think it generally most acceptable to go to Church, and to join in God's publick Worship on a Sunday; and to stay away upon those Occasions, which our Lord and Saviour has expresly commanded, and upon others of a like Nature? By this time, I hope, it will appear, that the Throat of the Author of the Postscript's Criticisms is cut, instead of 'the Throat of Occasional Conformity,' which the Writer of the Postscript possibly finds so very difficult a thing to do, that he would have gladly found it done to his hands.

A second Letter, p. 24.

This Vindication of the Consistency of the Principles of Stated Dissent and Occasional Conformity, will serve, I hope, to set * another Author right, who with a small variety has made the same Objection to 'em upon that account with the Postscript. Our Author is oblig'd to that Author for the Temper, which, baiting a Sally or two, runs thro the whole of it towards him, however narrow the Principles are which he lays down. But our Author hopes he needs make no Apology to the World, for not giving it as particular an Answer, as he has done to the Postscript. 'The Letter to a Friend' having taken the same unjust Course with 'the Rights of Protestant Dissenters,' which has been charg'd upon the Postscript, p. 88, 90. A method so apparently unjust, that it wou'd have prevented our Author from taking any notice of the Postscript, as well as of the Letter, in order to his own Vindication, if there had not been some particular Reasons for his taking notice of the Postscript, which don't hold in the present Case. That I may just shew that 'the Letter to a 'Friend' is liable to this *Exception* before I conclude, I will give the State of the far greater part of the Controversy, between our Author and him. There are two Exceptions, among others, that may be suppos'd to be brought against the Toleration of Occasional Conformists, namely, that they are Hypocrites and Schismaticks: Which are thus remov'd, that they are neither Hypocrites nor Schismaticks; or that if they were both the one and the other, they ought not to be depriv'd of the benefit of a Toleration. Now in answer to this, 'the Letter to a Friend' pretends to prove nothing more, than that they are both Schismaticks and Hypocrites (tho Mr. Dodwell || owns

|| *Occasional Communion fundamentally destructive, &c* §. 30. *a place I happen'd to dip upon in turning the Book over.*

* *The Author of a Letter to a Friend, in which the Occasional Conformists are prov'd to be guilty of Schism and Hypocrisy; in answer to some Arguments produc'd to the contrary, in a late Pamphlet, entitl'd* The Rights of the Protestant Dissenters: *printed at the Theater in Oxford.*

that

that the latter is impoſſible to be prov'd) but does not offer at any thing to prove, that if they are Schiſmaticks and Hypocrites, they ought to be depriv'd of their Toleration: Whereas without proving this, all that he has ſaid, were it perfectly concluſive, wou'd not at all confute 'the Rights of Proteſtant Diſſenters.'

But it ſeems this is the way of writing now *in faſhion.* Inſtead of ſhewing the Injuſtice and Inconſiſtency of any Cauſe, the preſent Writers only ſet themſelves to ſhew the Inconſiſtencys and Abſurditys of its Advocates: And inſtead of laying the whole of their Arguments together, and repreſenting 'em to the beſt Advantage, before they confute 'em, they only play the Sophiſter or the Critick. They find out here and there a flaw, and print their Diſcoverys under the Title of 'Specimens of the Anſwerableneſs' of a Book, to which they ought to give an Anſwer; but inſtead of which, they only publiſh its Errata. If they go on to write thus, our Author hopes he ſhall be excus'd, if he keeps his Word, and does not anſwer 'em. For he has ſomething elſe to do with a few of thoſe leiſure hours, which Men who have the Happineſs to live in our Univerſitys, have the good Fortune to abound with, than to ſpend 'em in playing the Critick, and to prove that he has not been guilty of the ſlips in Controverſy which others wou'd charge upon him, or that they are not guilty of far greater.

Rights of Proteſtant Diſſenters, p. 78.

Our Author however wou'd have taken care, that the five laſt Leaves of 'the Letter to a Friend' ſhou'd have been conſider'd, becauſe the main point of the Controverſy is there touch'd upon, if he had not ſeen a *third* Pamphlet, entitled, 'the Rights of the Church 'of England,' which poſſibly together with this, will make up a compleat Anſwer to 'the Rights of the Proteſtant Diſſenters.' Our Author has not yet had time to read any of it; but he is ſo much in earneſt in ſearch after Truth, that as ſoon as he has, if he finds that it enters into the Merits of the Cauſe, and that debating it will help to clear the Truth of the Points in queſtion, he promiſes it ſhall have its due Conſideration. And this he is the more willing to do, becauſe he is every day more and more perſuaded, that all Principles but thoſe of an Univerſal and Abſolute Toleration, lead to Popery or Hobbiſm.

But he hopes the Authors of that Book have purſu'd the Rules of Diſpute, which he has laid down elſewhere, and have conſider'd and ſtated what he ſays, as fairly as he has ſtated every thing advanc'd by Sir H. M. before he pretended to refute it. This he thinks is the leaſt he can expect from the Place whence that Book comes, and from the Combination which has been pleas'd to think it worth their while to

Rights of Proteſtant Diſſenters, Part I. p. 75, 76.

anſwer

answer 'the Rights of Protestant Dissenters.' But if they have swerv'd from those just Rules of Controversy, and have left our Author's principal Difficultys unanswer'd, only to entertain themselves with his Mistakes (as the Anthor of 'the Postscript,' and 'the Letter to a Friend' have done) after that our Author has so earnestly desir'd the contrary of 'em, as Truth was dear to 'em; and after he has taken so much care not to be guilty of this Fault himself: he hopes all the World will take this manner of proceeding to be the Symptoms of a desperate Cause; and that they will conclude, if his Book receives no other Answer, 'tis because it won't admit of it. If the learned and ingenious Authors of this Answer particularly, shall only distort our Author's meaning, that there may be something to confute; and laying aside Reasons and Arguments, shall only address themselves to Mens Passions, and vent their own in a manner that is altogether unbecoming Civility and good Manners, and inconsistent with a Christian Spirit; our Author finds himself ty'd up from making any Return, but his constant Prayer to Almighty God to forgive 'em, and to grant 'em a Temper that is more becoming the Gospel of Peace.

He wou'd at the same time leave it to Mankind to *Judg*, which Principles look more like those of true Christianity: The Principles of Force and Constraint, which lead Men to such Heat, Rancour and Violence; or those of an Universal and Absolute Toleration, with which such Rage and Fury is altogether inconsistent: And which has the best Right to a Toleration, Railing or Religion. I am inform'd, that there is something so unusually bitter and venomous in this Performance, that a certain Gentleman, who has had some hand in it, has thought it proper for him to certify it Publickly, that he has nothing to do with any thing, but the Argumentative part of it. I am surpriz'd that there should be any parts of it that are confess'd not to be Argumentative. What those parts are which are own'd not to be argumentative, and which can yet be produc'd in answer to 'the Rights of Protestant Dissenters,' I can't well imagine. However I suppose it will be agreed on all hands, that those Parts are not worth answering, which one of its Authors shou'd think necessary in so publick and unusual manner to disown. His Ingenuity sets off their Virulence; tho, as I am inform'd by those that have read the Performance, it needs no foil.

FINIS.

The Reader is desir'd to take notice, that it is the second Edition of the first Part of 'the Rights of Protestant Dissenters,' which is quoted in this Postscript; and also that the 28th Page of the Book is misnumber'd, which he's desir'd to mend with his Pen.



THE RIGHTS OF *Protestant Dissenters.*

Part II.

Being a Vindication of their Right to an Absolute Toleration, from the Objections of Sir H. MACKWORTH, in his Treatise entitled *Peace at Home.*

I am unsatisfy'd with my self how we can in Justice pass any such Bill as is propos'd. For I never heard of any Law, which made an Opinion in Religion a Cause to be dispossest of Right. D. F—ch in his Speech against the Exclusion Bill. Collection of Debates of the House of Commons held at Westminst. Octob. 21, 1680. P. 46.

London, Printed in the Year M. DCC. V.

Price 12*d.*



The PREFACE.

I Think it has been pretty generally agreed among unbiass'd Men, that to prevent Occasional Conformity, by depriving every Man of all Offices which he holds at present, and incapacitating him for 'em for the future, who should but once go to any Place of Publick Worship, not according to the Usage of the Church of England, would be inconsistent with the Toleration. But whether the Attempts, that have been made to do it, have proceeded from a Design to prevent a Practice, merely as it was pretended to be hypocritical, or to secure the Church and State; or only to weaken the Toleration, seems to have remain'd a Question among enquiring Men something longer.

And indeed it must be own'd, that there was more room for a Debate upon this Head than upon the former: The Question about the Nature of Occasional Conformity and its Consequences, being in a great measure new, perplex'd and intricate. Some specious and popular Objections too had been rais'd against Occasional Conformity, and the Men that practis'd it; and but little had been advanc'd in answer. Those that have laid a Design, having always this Advantage over their Adversarys, that their Attacks are in a much greater Forwardness, than the Defence of the others possibly can be.

But since such pains have been taken to set this Controversy in a true Light, and Men have had time to consider, and to see the Injustice these Deprivations and Incapacitys wou'd do the Dissenters, and how little they deserve to be so hardly us'd, and that it will by the following Discourse more fully appear, how unserviceable this Usage will be to the Church as well as to the State; whoever now shews himself zealous for these Deprivations and Incapacitys, must pull off the Mask and openly declare for Persecution: Especially since Deprivations and Incapacitys punishing only Dissenting Magistrates (a thing

very peculiar in a Law against Dissenters) *appears at the first view to be design'd, among other ends, to remove one of the main Pillars of the Toleration; which is not only supported by Laws, but by Magistrates and Officers who must put those Laws in execution.*

And that the Zeal for laying the Dissenters under these Deprivations and Incapacitys, proceeds from an Inclination to impair the Toleration, and not to prevent Hypocrisy or to secure the Church, to have other Considerations, is more than probable from hence; that some of those, who have appear'd the warmest for taking this Course, have since the finishing these Papers, commenc'd Prosecutions in the Spiritual Courts against the Dissenters in several parts of England, upon some pretended Flaw and Slip, that they hope they have at last found out by their great Study and Acuteness in the Act of Toleration, so many years after that Act has been made.

*This is an undeniable Evidence, that how much soever some Men may pretend to be for the Toleration, and even to secure it by these Deprivations and Incapacitys, yet that really they are Enemys to it; and wou'd not only make new Penal Laws against Dissenters for their conscientious Dissent, which they pretend they are not exempted from by the Act of Toleration; but such as they themselves have confess'd, they were freed from by that Act *: And wou'd begin to worry the Dissenters again with their vexatious Suits, if the Law did not prevent 'em. Since when they imagine there's any room left for it, they presently begin to inflict their Ecclesiastical Censures, for not conforming to the Ceremonys of the Church.*

And since the unwearied Attempts that have been made of late to obtain new Laws inconsistent with the Toleration, and the Endeavors that are us'd to invalidate that Act it self, seem to bespeak the Toleration in so much danger, I must sub-

* Sir H. M. owns that a Freedom from Prosecutions for Conscience-sake is a part of the Toleration, B. p. 3. §. 3.

mit

mit it to the Judgment of those, to whom 'tis presumption to dictate, whether some Method should not be thought of, to remove this Doubt that some have rais'd about the meaning of the Act of Toleration; and to put a Law, by which the most undoubted and indefeasible Right of Mankind is protected, and the publick Quiet so much secur'd, out of the reach of any Attempts to encroach upon it, or to repeal it for the future. I'm sure they must oppose this with a very ill Grace, who seem to be so fond of declaring themselves steady Friends to the Toleration, as to have taken an Occasion to assert, that it ought to be inviolably observ'd, when others thought they were defeating its general Design, and undermining the Whole.

'Tis a Law in which every Man finds his Advantage so much, Churchman as well as Dissenter, that if they wou'd but give themselves leave to consider, none wou'd oppose it. For to say the Truth, Establishing a Religion being nothing else than giving its Professors a great many Privileges, and Tolerating a Religion being nothing else than giving its Professors some few Privileges; the present Establishment of the Church is in propriety only a more ample Toleration, as the Toleration is only a more narrow Establishment. He therefore that petitions the Legislature to take away the whole of the Toleration, or any part of it, like Zebedee's Children, when they wou'd have call'd for fire from Heaven, knows not what he asks; and only sets a Precedent to the Dissenters, to desire the Legislature to repeal the Establishment, or to the Legislature to do it, whether It is sollicited to it or no.

I'm sure the Dissenters have as much Right and greater Provocations to ask it, and the Legislature to grant it, than any Churchman can have to desire the least Encroachment upon the Toleration. He that having abundance of large Privileges, won't let his Neighbour enjoy his lesser ones peaceably, seems to have a Mind set upon domineering, and ought to be taken care of, lest he grow too big for Subjection to his Superiors,

as

as well as too uneasy for a quiet Life with his Equals. He discovers such an Inclination to engross all the Protection and Favors of the Government, and to enrich himself by the Spoils of other Men, that the Legislature may be as justly incens'd against him, as the good King of Israel was against the oppressive rich Man in the Prophet's Parable.

And indeed an Establishment of any Religious Party is but a narrow Foundation to build its own Liberty upon. He that would secure the Liberty of worshipping God according to the Usage of the Church of England, in the surest manner that may be to himself and to his Posterity, will find, that that is best to be done, by getting all the Securitys that are possible, for giving a Liberty to every Man to worship God according to his Conscience, and to punish any Man that shall invade that Right, as a Man that robs on the Highway, or that disturbs the publick Peace, or any the most known Right of Mankind. For every Party will do their utmost to maintain such Laws as these: Whereas a Law, that establishes any one Religious Party, will aggrieve all others, and will be oppos'd and undermin'd upon all Occasions.

And methinks the Circumstances of Affairs as well as the Nature of the thing seems to hint such a Project as this is to us. For since Almighty God has, by so signal and surprizing a Victory, freed our State, among others, from the Oppression with which a Common Disturber threaten'd our Libertys, there can be no Return more proper for this Nation to make for so great a Blessing, than to restore any Right that has been unjustly taken from any of its Subjects, or to give a better Security to any that want it. And let no Protestant, who wishes, that the Emperor may make this use of his Deliverance in behalf of the Protestants of the Empire, and his Protestant Subjects in Hungary, wish to see any other use of it made against Protestant Dissenters here.

The

The Right of the Diſſenters to an Abſolute Toleration vindicated.

SINCE it would be unfair in an Appeal to the World to bring Evidence but on one ſide, I having produc'd in the Firſt Part what the Proteſtant Diſſenters ſay for themſelves, and anſwer'd their Adverſarys Exceptions to their Defence, find my ſelf oblig'd by the Rules of common Juſtice to conſider what is alledg'd againſt 'em. But here I ſhall barely confine my ſelf to the Objections that fall under one Head of the former Treatiſe; and not concerning my ſelf with thoſe made againſt other Points of the Diſſenting Controverſy, ſhall barely *vindicate* the Diſſenters Right to *an Abſolute Toleration* from the *Objections of Sir H. M:* Which may be conſider'd as Arguments againſt the Diſſenters Title to a Toleration, tho he propoſes 'em as Arguments to prove the Uſefulneſs and Neceſſity of the Occaſional Conformity Bill.

Sir H. has ſpent a great deal of pains in anſwering the Objections, which the Managers for the Lords brought againſt that Bill, as it was ſent up to them in Decemb. 1702. But I ſhall *not concern my ſelf* with any part of

Sir H's Treatiſe, as it comes under that view, and ſhall only make uſe of it, whenever it ſerves to explain or to give any better color to the Propoſitions which he lays down to vindicate the main Deſign of that Bill. For conſidering that their Lordſhips Objections againſt that Bill were rather regulated by the Orders and Rules of their Houſe, than by their own particular Judgments of the Merits of Occaſional Conformity, and were rather level'd at ſome Parts of the Bill, than againſt its Deſign; it wou'd be foreign to my purpoſe to enter into that Debate. I'm ſure it wou'd be altogether needleſs, ſince their Lordſhips Objections to thoſe Parts of that Bill againſt which they are brought ſeem ſo reaſonable, and Sir H's Attempts to enervate 'em ſo ineffectual, that nothing needs be added to ſhew the Strength of the former, or the Weakneſs of the latter. Sir H. ſeems to be ſo diffident of this part of his Performance himſelf, that he refers us 'to the 'Honorable Houſe of Commons for better Anſwers to 'the Objections brought againſt the Bill, and for better 'Amendments in order to our fuller Satisfaction.

B. p. 12. Poſtſcript.

Inſtead therefore of debating with Sir H. from what Offices a Diſſenter ſhould be excluded, and under what Penaltys; I ſhall betake my ſelf to the other Part of his Book, and *conſider*, whether *his Arguments prove* that a Diſſenter ought to be excluded from *any* publick *Employments*, tho it were under the *mildeſt Penaltys* imaginable. And to this Conſideration Sir H. has limited me, ſince he has not thought fit to anſwer the Objections in ſeveral * Pamphlets that came out this year and the laſt againſt the Deſign and Intent of the Bill; nor given me the opportunity to free thoſe Arguments from his Exceptions.

* Letter to a Peer. The Intereſt of England in reſpect to Proteſtants Diſſenting from the Eſtabliſh'd Church, &c. Moderation a Vertue.

What-

Whatever has induc'd Sir H. to be guilty of this Omiſſion, it cou'd not be, that he thought an Anſwer to thoſe Objections altogether needleſs. For ſuppoſing that the Diſſenters, who don't pretend much to Politics, had ſaid nothing in their own behalf that Sir H. cou'd have condeſcended to reply to (tho ſuch a Condeſcenſion wou'd have tended mightily to free 'em from the Fears and Jealouſys which the Scope and Drift of this Bill had fill'd their Minds withal, and which Sir H. profeſſes to be the chief end of his appearing in Print) yet certainly he cou'd not think it ſuperfluous, or below him, to anſwer the Opinion of a learned Gentleman, concerning 'the 'Inconveniencys of this Bill, addreſs'd to her Majeſty 'under all the Ornaments of Oratory and good Lan-'guage. Pref. p. 1. §. 7. Ded. p. 1. §. 2.

Poſſibly Sir H. found that this was not eaſily to be done: For he ſeems tacitly to confeſs, that there are ill Conſequences attending the Excluſion of all Diſſenters from Employments; and puts the Queſtion in my opinion only upon this Iſſue, whether there are not greater Inconveniencys in allowing them to remain capable of any. For he tells her Majeſty, 'That the Conſequences that 'may be ſuppos'd to happen upon ſuch a Bill, or 'which the Wit of Man can poſſibly invent or imagine 'as poſſible, will not diſcourage her Majeſty from con-'curring with her Parliament in paſſing ſuch a Law, as 'they [i. e. the Houſe of Commons] conceive to be 'reaſonable, and even neceſſary to preſerve Peace at 'home, and to promote, &c. By this it appears, that Sir H. is well appriz'd of our Strength, and that he thinks it upon that account more adviſable to fortify his Camp than to attack ours. By *acting* thus *upon* the *defenſive*, poſſibly he hop'd to have conceal'd his Weakneſs, and to have ſecur'd the Palladium from the Fire of the Enemy. But perhaps Sir H. will find himſelf diſap- Ded. p. 3. §. 3.

pointed, when he ſees us leave our own Intrenchments, and attempt to force his: So that I can't help flattering my ſelf, that his Caution upon this occaſion will do him as little Service, as his Heat does upon ſome others. I'm ſure it ought to give a juſt Prejudice to his Cauſe, and render it leſs difficult for us to convince the World that it is not to be defended.

And if we ſhou'd uſe no other Artillery in this Enterprize, but that which Sir H. has furniſh'd us withal, and ſhou'd only *turn his own Cannon upon* him, we cou'd not fail of Succeſs. For ſince we have not only prov'd in the Former Part, but have produc'd ſome Paſſages out of Sir H. which ſo fully recognize the Title every man has to a Toleration, the Efficacy of an abſolute Indulgence, and the Inefficacy of Perſecution to prevail upon the Minds of men: and ſince we have ſhewn an Excluſion of Diſſenters from all Offices to be inconſiſtent with a Toleration, and a Perſecution for Conſcience ſake, that it ſelf is ſufficient to anſwer all that Sir H. has ſaid for the Uſefulneſs and Neceſſity of ſuch an Excluding Bill. For whatever he can poſſibly alledg for ſuch an Excluſion after all this, amounts only to ſo many Objections againſt a Truth, which he himſelf has laid down as a Principle that he has always entertain'd. So that we might juſtly leave the Task we have undertaken to Sir H. and deſire the Favor of him at his leiſure to anſwer his own Arguments, both to ſhew the Conſiſtency of one Truth, and of one of his own Principles with ſome others of 'em. And if Sir H. wou'd ſo far oblige us, we might juſtly hope for peculiar Succeſs. For ſince he has promis'd, 'that he will readily ſubmit to the greater Judgment 'of any man, who ſhall argue fairly and not conceal 'his Principles 'if his Arguments deſerve it,' he will find

Part 1. p. 21, 22.

Part 1. p. 34, 35, 36.

Pref. p. 1. §. 9.

Pref. p. 2. §. 4.

find much less difficulty to yield to his own. Such a Submission to the Truth from him wou'd be of singular Service, and might be so much the more expected, if he wou'd undertake himself, by how much 'tis generally thought equally honorable to find out ones own Weakness, and shameful to have it discover'd by any body else.

But possibly Sir H. has not leisure for this Engagement: and therefore since he has been so charitable as to endeavour to set the World right about the Occasional Conformity Bill, and at peace with one another after all their Differences concerning it; I think my self bound in return to do what I can to *set Sir H. right* in his Notions of the Design of this Bill, and to shew him the best way of being *reconcil'd with himself*. In order to this, as we have endeavour'd in the Former Part to establish the Truth of his standing Principles concerning a Toleration, so we'll now endeavour to satisfy Him, and all that are of his opinion, that there is no force in his Arguments for the Bill, which I believe are Opinions that he has taken up but of late; and so that he need be at no further trouble than to part with them, to free the Truth and his own Principles from any Contradiction.

His Arguments for excluding Dissenters from all public Employments are these three. 1. Because admitting 'em is inconsistent with the Practice of all wise Nations. 2. With the plain Intent and Meaning of our Laws. 3. With the Safety of Church and State. For in this order Sir H. treats of 'em from P. 1. to the 4*th*. Tho in P. 4. §. 3. he proposes 'em in the contrary Method; and in the next Paragraph Sir H. is pleas'd with some contradiction to confound their Meaning and their Method too. But I shall treat of 'em in the *Order* Sir H. has propos'd 'em in the third Paragraph, both in justice to my Reader and him; since Sir H. there states 'em the most naturally

and

and diſtinctly to be refuted or prov'd. For if it can be made out, that the admitting Diſſenters to public Employments is not inconſiſtent with the Safety of the Church and State, it will appear that there's no reaſon to exclude 'em, tho other Nations ſhou'd have done it, or tho our own Legiſlators in former Reigns had deſign'd it. But if I can't make good the firſt of theſe Aſſertions, Sir H. will have no great difficulty to prove the two others. And ſince the Strength of his three Arguments lies chiefly in the firſt, we'll conſider each Part of it by it ſelf, and ſhew, (1) That the Admiſſion of Diſſenters to public Employments is not inconſiſtent with the Safety of the State, nor (2) with the Safety of the Church.

I wou'd only beg leave before-hand to make two Remarks upon Sir H's *manner* of ſtating the Queſtion. The Title-page and the Preface tell us the Deſign of the Book is to vindicate the Proceedings of the Houſe of Commons on the Bill to prevent Occaſional Conformity. That Bill excluded ſome Churchmen, and excluded them as well as the Diſſenters from all Employments of Honor or Profit, that either were confer'd by the favor of the Queen or the People; and Sir H. to vindicate this Bill only pretends to prove, that 'tis neceſſary to exclude all Diſſenters from public Employments. Sir H. has no where told us what he means by *Public Employments*. If he only means Civil Offices by it, and Employments under the Government, and ſo oppoſes public Employments to the private ones of a Profeſſion or a Trade, I have nothing to ſay againſt this Term in the Queſtion. But either this Expreſſion means more than that, and denotes the high Offices of State, in oppoſition to thoſe of leſſer conſequence (which I'm the more apt to believe it does, be-

Pref. p. 1. §. 7.

B. p. 1. §. 2. p. 4. §. 3.

cauſe

cauſe he elſewhere calls 'em the Adminiſtration of publick Affairs) or elſe he uſes it only to caſt a miſt before the Reader's Eyes, the beſt Defence of a bad Cauſe. For had not this word [Public] been foiſted into the Queſtion, it wou'd have appear'd a ridiculous Propoſition at firſt ſight, and provok'd Laughter rather than Concern at any Danger that threatned the Church or State, from a Diſſenter's being let into any of the petty Offices of England. B. p. 1. §. 1. p. 4. §. 4.

The other Remark that I wou'd premiſe is, that whereas Sir H. pretends in ſtating the Queſtion, that the Danger that threatens the Church and State from the Principles of the Diſſenters, juſtifys the excluding 'em from public Offices, yet that neither the danger of the one nor the other is the *true Deſign of the Bill.* For if it was, why did it exclude Occaſional Nonconformiſts? Since certainly their Principles cannot ſo much as be pretended to be inconſiſtent with the Safety of the Church or State: for they amount to no more than this, that the Churches of the Diſſenters are barely lawful, but that the Church of England is by much the preferable. Nay theſe Men muſt both in the nature of the thing, and according to Sir H's way of reaſoning (who thinks an Inclination to execute all the Laws of the Kingdom neceſſary to qualify an Officer, as we ſhall ſee by and by) be the fitteſt Men in England to be employ'd to execute the Laws, which at the ſame time that they eſtabliſh the Church, tolerate the Diſſenters; ſince they may juſtly be ſuppos'd better inclin'd than any others, to execute the Laws which maintain both the Eſtabliſhment and the Toleration. So that if Sir H. had ſtated the Queſtion fairly, and wou'd have vindicated the Bill to purpoſe, he ſhou'd have prov'd, that the Admiſſion of any man that goes but once to a Meeting into the moſt inconſiderable Office of Honor or Profit in the Kingdom,

dom, is inconsistent with the Safety of the Church and State. But as this must be a Demonstration to all thinking men, that the design of the Bill is not the bare Security of the Church and State from the Principles and Designs of the Dissenters, so such a State of the Question wou'd have prov'd, that Sir H. to turn his own words upon him, 'is not contending for a Security to the 'Church and State, but for Power and Dominion,' and to monopolize and perpetuate it, in the hands of men of his Party and particular Persuasion.

B. p. 11. §. 5.

And tho Sir H. don't talk so openly as this, and pretends all along, that the Dissenters are to be excluded from all Publick Offices to secure the Church and State, yet he lets a word drop by chance that shews, that a man was to be incapacitated for all Offices for going to a Meeting, not purely to secure the Church and State from the dangerous Principles of the Dissenters, but *to prevent the Occasional Nonconformity* of Churchmen. For he tells us,

B. p. 8. §. 1. 'It was not fit to exempt the Protestant Dissenters from 'Offices of Burden, tho they were incapacitated for Offices 'of Favor, because the easing the Dissenters in that par- 'ticular wou'd have a different Effect from what was de- 'sign'd, and wou'd by establishing Occasional Noncon- 'formity, encrease an Evil this Bill was design'd to re- 'medy.

And since by all this it appears that the Bill had some other design than barely excluding the Dissenters from Offices because of their dangerous Principles; and that it was particularly intended to prevent Occasional Nonconformity, and to exclude some Churchmen as well as Dissenters from all sorts of Offices of Honor or Profit: it is evident, that tho Sir H. cou'd prove his Assertion, and make it appear, that the admission of Dissenters into publick Offices is inconsistent with the Safety of Church and State, yet he cou'd not thereby vindicate the Occasional Confor-

Conformity Bill. So that as a late ingenious Author has observ'd Sir H. to be guilty of begging the Question twelve times in this Treatise, we may add to make up the number thirteen, that he has entirely *mistaken it here.*

Occasional Letter. N°. 1. p. 30, 31, 32.

But let us see whether the *Assertions themselves* can be made out. And first let us see whether the admission of Dissenters to public Offices *be inconsistent with the Safety of the State.* I am very sorry Sir H. has not explain'd any of these Terms, and has left me so liable to mistake his meaning. Sir H. uses such general Expressions 'of the esta-'blish'd Government in Church and State, of Uniformity, Establish'd Religion, and Establish'd Constitution (that I may use the words of a Learned Serjeant) 'as seem indifferently calculated, and may indifferently serve for the Meridian of Edinburg, Geneva, 'Paris, Rome, or Constantinople; and with a small 'variation of Names may be publish'd in behalf of 'the Constitutions in Church and State in all those 'places. However that if I mistake, I mayn't at least be mistaken, I wou'd take the liberty to tell my Reader what these words here *stand for.* The State signifys the present Constitution, and (its Perpetuity in) the Protestant Succession: And the present Constitution consists in the Rights of the People, and the Powers of the Government: And they are either the joint Powers of the Sovereign and the two Houses of Parliament for making good Laws, or the separate Powers (1.) of the two Houses of Parliament, which consist (besides the Powers of Impeachment and Judicature) in giving their Opinion and Advice; and (2.) of the Sovereign, which consists in the just Exercise of the Prerogative, the due Execution of the Laws, and pursuing the Advice of

Catholicism without Popery, the second Part, by John Hooke Serjeant at Law.

the two Houſes of Parliament, as often as the Sovereign ſhall judg it for the good of the People. The Safety of the State conſiſts in the preſervation of the preſent Conſtitution and the Proteſtant Succeſſion; and in taking thoſe Meaſures which are neceſſary to that end. Theſe at preſent ſeem chiefly to be the maintaining a good Correſpondence between the Sovereign and the two Houſes; reducing the exorbitant Power of France, which threatens both the Conſtitution and the Succeſſion; a Security from the Non-Jurors in the three Kingdoms, who deny the Government their Allegiance, and can't be its Friends; and from the Papiſts, who are Subjects to a Foreign Juriſdiction, and muſt neceſſarily be its Enemys.

This is what I mean by the State and its Safety. But becauſe ſome men affix other Ideas to theſe words, and which are hardly to be ſeparated from them when they occur; I wou'd juſt hint it, that by the State *I don't mean* any Branch of Arbitrary Power, nor any of the Meaſures neceſſary to introduce it. I wou'd not therefore be thought to go about to prove, that to admit Diſſenters to Offices, is not in ſome meaſure inconſiſtent with the Doctrines of the Divine Right of Kingly Authority, of its unlimited Extent, or of the indiſpenſible neceſſity of its being propagated in the Right Line; or with the Doctrines of an Abſolute Non-Reſiſtance and Paſſive-Obedience to the Crown which ſpring from them; or with the Practices which tend to reſtore them. Such as ſtretching the Prerogative in one Reign to ſerve ſome turns, and the Rights of the Houſe of Commons in another to ſerve a different one: But which ſtill manifeſtly tend to weaken the preſent happy Conſtitution and the Proteſtant Succeſſion, and to make room for the ſubverſion of our Libertys, the bringing in theſe Principles of Slavery and the pretended Prince of Wales. And I wou'd here particularly

cularly deſire Sir H. M. to take notice, that I don't pretend, that to admit Diſſenters to Offices, is not inconſiſtent with giving 'the Sovereign a Diſpenſing Power, or 'with acknowledging his Right to levy Cuſtoms without 'conſent of Parliament, or with flattering him 'that 'tis as good a Right as any in Magna Charta, and 'more antient, and thereby to deſtroy both Property and 'Parliaments at the ſame time.' If Sir H. means this by aſſerting, that the admiſſion of Diſſenters to public Employments is in ſome meaſure inconſiſtent with the Safety of the State, I have the honor to agree with him entirely. But all that I wou'd contend for, to ſtate the Queſtion clearly, and that there may be no Subterfuge in the ambiguous Term of Public Employments, is, *That the admiſſion of Diſſenters into any Offices or Employments under the Government whatſoever, is no ways inconſiſtent with the preſervation of the preſent Conſtitution and the Proteſtant Succeſſion.*

Sir H's Addreſs preſented to K. James. Gazette, N° 2015.

I. To *prove* this it will be ſufficient to ſhew, that the Proteſtant Diſſenters, and particularly thoſe whom this Bill was chiefly aim'd at, and wou'd have principally affected, have been always equally zealous in endeavouring to preſerve the Conſtitution from Alterations of every ſort, either from a Foreign Force and Invaſion, or the illegal Encroachments of the Crown, or of the People. And to prove this, nothing more will be neceſſary than barely to recollect their Conduct. For they impartially, in conjunction with both Houſes of Parliament, oppos'd the unreaſonable and precipitate Meaſures of King Ch. I. and the beheading him afterwards by the * Army. They Remonſtrated againſt the Subverſion of the Government, and ſuffer'd often during the Diſorders of thoſe times for attempting its Reſtoration, and were at laſt very inſtrumental in bringing it about. During the Reign of King

* *See the Remonſtrance of about ſixty of their principal Miniſters againſt it, printed in the year 1648. annext to the I. Part.*

Charles II. they offer'd themſelves a perpetual Sacrifice, rather than let the Papiſts reap any Benefit, or the State receive any detriment by their Eaſe and Safety; and did what they cou'd by falling in with the Endeavours to exclude the Duke of York, to the hazard and loſs of many of their Eſtates and Lives, to ſave us the danger and expence of a Revolution. And when the defeating that Deſign made the late happy one at laſt neceſſary, they had the Honor to pave the way to it, and heartily to abet it, together with the preſent Settlement of the Crown, and the Succeſſion in the Proteſtant Line. They have been true to this glorious Cauſe ever ſince, in Parliament, in Places, and in their private Capacitys. They, who have had the Honor to ſit in Parliament, have faln in with thoſe worthy Patriots, that were the forwardeſt to give Taxes; and the reſt have been as remarkably chearful in paying them, and in filling the Loans when Credit was at the loweſt Ebb. Thoſe of 'em that had a ſhare in the public Adminiſtration, diſcharg'd their Truſt with that ſingular Fidelity, that none of the Miſmanagements of public Monys, which have been ſo mightily complain'd of, have been ever laid at their door. Their Pulſe has always beat with that of the Public. No Reſentment nor Apprehenſions of their own particular Danger cou'd ever make them dejected at any public Advantage, or eaſy under a common Calamity. No Cowardice ever made 'em deſert the Abdication Intereſt under all its difficultys. Nor did any baſer Principle ever influence 'em to betray it, by diſcouraging its Friends, or giving any Aſſiſtance to its Enemys. The Oppoſers of the Excluſion of the Duke of York, of the Abdication, of the preſent Settlement of the Crown, of the Proteſtant Succeſſion and the preſent War; or of Taxes, Aſſociations, and Abjurations, in order to ſupport 'em: The Betrayers of our Counſels, the Clogs to public

public Buſineſs, the Traytors to this Government and the laſt, the intended Aſſaſſins of K. William of ever-glorious Memory, and the Men whoſe common Talk has been all along the Reverſe of the public Intereſt, were no Diſſenters nor Occaſional Conformiſts.

Seeing then 'tis notorious to all that no Men have been more faithful than the Diſſenters in ſerving the Government, ſince it has been ſettled upon its true Baſis, they can't hear themſeves *coupled with Papiſts* without a juſt Indignation and Reſentment. 'Tis true, as Sir H. M. obſerves, that the Papiſts are Engliſhmen as well as the Proteſtant Diſſenters, if being born of Engliſh Parents, or living on an Engliſh Soil, can entitle 'em to that Denomination, and the Privileges that attend it. But a Capacity of public Employments is a Privilege, which tho their Birth gives 'em, they voluntarily renounce; and which the Diſſenters have done nothing to forfeit. For can a Papiſt have an Engliſh Heart, or do the Proteſtant Diſſenters want it? Can the Roman Catholicks be ſubject to an Engliſh Juriſdiction, or do the Proteſtant Nonconformiſts own any foreign one? How comes it then to paſs, that a Gentleman who underſtands our Conſtitution ſo well as Sir H. and who has writ a Treatiſe upon the Rights of the ſeveral Parts that compoſe it, can put Papiſts and Proteſtant Diſſenters upon a level; or can think it any Conſequence, that if the Papiſts are juſtly excluded from all public Employments, Proteſtant Diſſenters may be ſo too? Or on the other hand, that if being an Engliſhman or an Engliſh Subject gives Diſſenters a Capacity to hold an Office, it muſt neceſſarily give thoſe of the Roman Communion the ſame? When a Papiſt is but a native Locuſt that lives upon our Productions and corrupts 'em, takes the Protection of the Government, and betrays it: And 'tis as a Traytor that he is made incapable of all Offices by our Laws,

B. p. 6. §. 3.

Laws, and not for holding Purgatory or the Doctrine of the Maſs, or any other Tenent, as 'tis merely different from thoſe of the Eſtabliſh'd Church.

I know 'tis pretended, that tho the Diſſenters own the Queen's Supremacy, and are not in any foreign Intereſt, yet that they are *Enemys to the Engliſh Conſtitution*, and bear an implacable Hatred to Monarchy, and are great Friends to a Commonwealth. Sir H ſays, that 'they are a Party of ſuch Principles as muſt inevitably 'end in the Ruin of the State, and therefore thinks 'that their Inconſiſtency with the public Safety is rather 'to be conſider'd as the reaſon of their Excluſion, than 'the nature of their Crimes. To prove the Inconſiſtency of their Principles with the Conſtitution, ſeveral Inſtances are produc'd. 'Tis alledg'd, that they were the Men that beheaded the King. A man muſt have a good Forehead to impute this Fact to the whole Body of the Diſſenters, when above ſixty of their principal Miniſters made ſo bold and ſo warm a Remonſtrance againſt it. But then 'tis inſiſted on, that all the Diſſenters join'd in taking up Arms againſt the King, and brought him to the Block, tho they did not cut off his Head. Properly ſpeaking, no Diſſenters took up Arms againſt the King. Thoſe that engag'd in the Civil War on the Parliament ſide were Conformiſts to the then Eſtabliſh'd Church. But ſuppoſing that they had been Diſſenters at the time they took up Arms againſt the King, wou'd it follow that they were greater Enemys to the Conſtitution than the Churchmen, who invited over a foreign Force, and join'd with it againſt K. James? Or does it follow, becauſe thoſe Men once oppos'd the illegal Proceedings of the Court, that a juſt and prudent Government wou'd be in any danger from them were they now alive? 'Tis farther pretended, that the Diſſenters were engag'd in ſeveral Plots againſt K. Charles II. One wou'd have

B. p. 6. §. 4.

ſcarce

ſcarce expected that the forg'd Villanys and brib'd Evidences, that were then made uſe of to trapan ſeveral worthy Perſons, and to ſpill ſome of the beſt Blood we cou'd boaſt of, ſhou'd have been produc'd as Authoritys againſt the Diſſenters now-adays, and at a time when 'tis become the Mode to ridicule a real Plot as a ſham one. But were it true, that ſome Diſſenters had been engag'd in Conſpiracys againſt the Perſon of King Charles II. it wou'd affect the Body of the Diſſenters at that time no more than 'Keys, Charnock, Sir William Perkins, Sir John Friend, 'and Sir John Fenwick's' being concern'd in the Conſpiracy to aſſaſſinate K. William, proves that all the High Churchmen or Nonjurors were embark'd in the ſame Deſign.

But a Crime quite contrary to all theſe is laid to the Diſſenters charge, and they are highly blam'd for turning Courtiers in the Reign of K. James II. for not writing ſo much againſt Popery as their Brethren did, and for running into the Meaſures of a diſpenſing Power. In anſwer to this it muſt be obſerv'd, that the Preſs was at that time ſhut againſt the Diſſenters, and ſeveral things ſtop'd and refus'd which they offer'd to the Public. But if they had not this to ſay for themſelves, it was no very ill Deſign in the Diſſenters to leave that Controverſy to the Church, not ſo much becauſe ſhe had brought us into the danger, as that by leaving the management of the Diſpute to her, ſhe might thereby learn the Principles of an abſolute and impartial Toleration of every man, in judging for himſelf about matters of Faith and Worſhip; which had been but too much oppos'd or too little regarded in the preceding Reign: And which the Church ſhou'd learn at any price, becauſe they are the only Principles upon which the Reformation ſtands. Or if the Diſſenters did not avoid entring into the Controverſy from that Deſign, yet when the moſt is made of this matter that can be,

it

it can amount to no more than the charge of a Neglect upon 'em. But it can never be imagin'd, that the Diſſenters, who have not only quitted the Doctrines, but every thing that's like the Ceremonys or Conſtitution of the Romiſh Church, cou'd poſſibly enter into a Deſign to promote its Intereſt. Some few of 'em tir'd out with a long and bitter Perſecution, might poſſibly run farther into the Meaſures of a diſpenſing Power for their own eaſe, than can be wholly juſtify'd; tho all the Severitys of the Reign preceding that, cou'd not bring them to fall in with thoſe Methods. But ſuch an undue Expreſſion of Joy at their Deliverance, may be juſtly pardon'd as a mere Frailty of human Nature. Others who did not ſuffer themſelves to be tranſported by the Pleaſure this Eaſe and Relaxation had given 'em, oppos'd the Addreſſes that were then made, and condemn'd 'em. And they who had been guilty, quickly found their Error, and comply'd with the honeſt and wiſe Advice of that accompliſh'd Stateſman the Lord Marquiſs of Halifax; which his Lordſhip and the beſt Churchmen had the gratitude afterwards to acknowledg. And his Lordſhip in return to their prudent Conduct became their Patron at the Revolution, and ſignaliz'd himſelf very much by his Endeavours to procure a Comprehenſion for ſome, and a Toleration for 'em all. But if ſome few of theſe miſtaken Diſſenters had never return'd to a better ſenſe during that Reign, why ſhou'd Sir H. conclude that they have not alter'd their Opinion, when I'm perſuaded he's deſirous the World ſhou'd think that ſince that time he has alter'd his? For I belive he wou'd not have any one take him for a man that wou'd at preſent have Cuſtoms levy'd without Conſent of Parliament, or be concern'd in regulating and garbling Corporations to ſerve any body, tho he thought fit to ſolicit the one, and as 'tis ſaid to tranſact the other to gratify a Prince that us'd all his Power to promote

His Letter to the Diſſenters.

promote the Intereſt of the Church of Rome.

But were all theſe Facts juſtly laid to the Charge of the Diſſenters in thoſe ſeveral Reigns, yet the preſent Body of Diſſenters can be affected by *no Principle* but what they hold, nor by *any Fact* but what they either have perpetrated or abetted. But to impute the Actions, and to charge the Principles of Predeceſſors to thoſe that ſucceed 'em in their general Character and Denomination, wou'd be a Charge no better grounded than to conclude, that Sir H. M. is a Commonwealths-man, becauſe his Grandfather acted in a Commiſſion under the Commonwealth againſt K. Ch. II. 'Tis ſo very obvious to every one, that theſe Charges are ſcanty and defective, that to eke 'em out, 'tis further urg'd, that the Diſſenters have Antimonarchical whiggiſh Principles, and wou'd clip the Prerogative, and encreaſe the Libertys of the People, till they have at laſt brought our Government to a Commonwealth. But whatever ſpecioufneſs there was in this Objection ſome years ago, yet it can't be urg'd with any face againſt them by their Adverſarys now; ſince their Complaint againſt the Diſſenters in the late Reign was, that they were turn'd Courtiers, whilſt they boaſted that they were the Succeſſors of the antient Whigs, pretending to act purſuant to thoſe Principles, when they brought in thoſe Limitations to the Bill for ſettling the Proteſtant Succeſſion, which have made greater advances to a Commonwealth than were ever made before, unleſs it were in Forty one.

Baker's Chron. p. 706. col. 2.

But if there were any Commonwealthſmen in England, and the Diſſenters were of that number, it wou'd be *dangerous* to exclude 'em from Offices, whilſt there are any Churchmen ſtand poſſeſt of 'em that are for Arbitrary Power. For thoſe that are for ſtretching the Prerogative, are equally deſtructive to a Limited Monarchy with thoſe that wou'd contract it. Whereas it may

be hop'd, that if both theſe ſorts of Men are ſuffer'd to continue in Offices, the true Conſtitution, which lys between both Extreams, may be preſerv'd by ballancing the Power of theſe jealous Pretenders: Like a petit State between two potent ones, who being each watchful to prevent the Inroads of the other, ſecure the leſſer from all danger, till one of them being reduc'd and broken, leaves the inconſiderable State an eaſy Prey to the Ambition of the Conqueror. So that upon the Suppoſition (which however is a very falſe one) that the Diſſenters are Commonwealths-men; yet if we wou'd preſerve our Conſtitution, we muſt either exclude Abſolute Monarchy-men from all Offices, or ſuffer the Diſſenters to enjoy 'em.

I can't here forbear making theſe two Reflections, as a Corollary from the Character of the Diſſenters as 'tis drawn by their greateſt Enemys. 1. That they are a ſet of men who principally *aim* at the preſervation of our common Libertys, and their own Toleration. Theſe Principles can't be dangerous, becauſe they are the End of our Government, and a Part of our Conſtitution. And, 2. that nothing has engaged 'em in undue *Meaſures* to attain theſe Ends, but illegal Prerogatives and Perſecution. For no Crimes are laid to their Charge ſince the Toleration they have obtain'd, and the Security of our Libertys which the late happy Revolution has given us. So that the End the Diſſenters aim at being lawful and good, 'tis but for the Government, according to their Enemys Repreſentation, to maintain the Juſt Rights of the People, and the Liberty of the Diſſenters, to keep 'em from all violent Methods to obtain thoſe Ends, and to unite 'em intirely in its Intereſts.

But to *grant* more to the Adverſarys of the Diſſenters than ever their Malice yet pretended, if it did appear that their Aims were prejudicial to the Government, and that they had a turbulent Spirit reſolutely bent upon any means

means by which thoſe Ends might be obtain'd; yet conſidering that they are independent from any Foreign Force of France or Rome, they cou'd not be thought dangerous. Nor cou'd it ever be in their power to hurt any Government, till by carrying on an Intereſt oppoſite to the People, it ſhall have rendred it ſelf odious, and provok'd the Body of the Engliſh Nation to join with them in reſcuing their Rights from an unjuſt Oppreſſion. Which was in a good meaſure the Caſe of the Revolution. And then the Diſſenters muſt inſtead of being dangerous to the Conſtitution, by their readineſs to fall in with ſuch Meaſures, become the moſt inſtrumental to reſtore it.

II. Thus we have prov'd, that the Toleration of the Diſſenters in Offices, is not inconſiſtent with the Safety of the State. Let us ſee what Sir H. *offers to prove that it is*; and that I may digeſt what he ſays, ſcattered up and down his Book, into the beſt order I can, for the eaſe of my Reader, and the ſtrength of Sir H's Argument, it may amount to this, (1.) That an excluſion of Diſſenters from Offices, wou'd procure us an Union. (2.) That that Union wou'd give us a good adminiſtration of the Laws at home, (3.) and a vigorous proſecution of the War abroad. (4.) That it wou'd be a Security to the Queen, (5.) to her Proteſtant Succeſſors; and (6.) to the Diſſenters themſelves.

1. Sir H. ſays, It wou'd procure us an *Union:* But I don't find that he any where tells us what this Union is. Indeed in ſome places he calls it *Uniformity* in the State; but he leaves us as much to ſeek what he means by it as by the other. Does he mean that by the excluſion of Diſſenters from Places, all the Officers of England wou'd be of one Stature, or of the ſame Complexion? It may be Sir H. will be angry with me for

Ded. p. 4. E. p. 11. §. 6, 9.

putting ſuch a meaning upon his words: But I can't ſee for what; for I'm ſure ſuch an Uniformity is as neceſſary to the Service and Security of the State, as that all Men in places ſhou'd pray to God with a Common-Prayer Book, or ſhou'd all receive the Sacrament kneeling, or have their Children baptiz'd with the Sign of the Croſs. And that this Uniformity is the moſt that Sir H. means by Union, appears from the Dedication: Where he tells her Majeſty, 'That ſuch an happy Union as Henry III. 'of France had almoſt obtain'd by the like Method, 'wou'd be an unſpeakable Bleſſing to this Nation.' Since thoſe Meaſures of Henry III. introduced nothing but an Uniformity in profeſſing the ſame Religion, but were ſo far from procuring Unity, that a Civil War enſu'd, wherein the Members of the Eſtabliſh'd Church, whom he had endeavour'd to oblige with his perſecuting Laws, were the Rebels, and one of 'em his Murderer; and the perſecuted Proteſtants (who were the Diſſenters) the Subjects to whom he fled for Aſſiſtance and Support.

P. 3. §. 2.

B. p. 11. §. 6. Indeed Sir H. tells us in another place, 'That this Bill 'will reſtore us *Peace at Home*, and will ſecure her Ma-'jeſty from the Danger of having two contending Partys 'in the Nation'. We ſhall ſee preſently whether it can do this or no. But better is it, that it ſhou'd not, according to Sir H's account of that Peace which it wou'd give us. For two contending Partys are better than one domineering one; and the Peace that's founded upon the Power of England's falling entirely into the hands of one of the Partys, will be a Peace without Liberty or Union either, and will make good the Character, that one of the Partys has gone under long ſince, that they'll unite with none but themſelves, and have Peace with no body but their Slaves.

But Sir H. gives us the moſt determinate Idea of the Union this Excluſion of Diſſenters is to compaſs, when he

he tells her Majeſty that it will make 'both [Churchmen and Diſſenters] '*join in the defence* of her Majeſty a-'gainſt the common Enemy': And this ſeems to be the beſt account he any where gives us of this Union. But does he mean that it will make the Diſſenters *Unite with the Churchmen*, or the Churchmen with the Diſſenters? If he means the firſt, 'tis no End that this Bill can promote, for 'tis attain'd already. No Men unite more chearfully with any for her Majeſty's defence againſt the common Enemy than they do. And if they join more readily with ſome Members of the Church than with others, 'tis becauſe thoſe ſeem to them to be the moſt heartily engag'd in that Cauſe, or to take the moſt prudent courſe to ſerve it. I never heard that the Diſſenters oppos'd the entring into this War, to ſupport her Majeſty's Title againſt the Pretender, or that they ever thought it to be impracticable, unneceſſary, or unjuſt; that they ever oppos'd Mony Bills, or ever gave 'em any unneceſſary Delays; that they ever talk'd of making Peace with France ſince the War has been begun, or ſhew'd any other uneaſineſs under it, than at its miſmanagements; or that they ever join'd with thoſe that did. It can be therefore no reaſon to exclude the Diſſenters from Offices, to make 'em unite with the Churchmen in her Majeſty's defence. And I think there's as little reaſon for their Excluſion, to make the Churchmen *join with them* for that purpoſe. For to exclude the Diſſenters from Places, wou'd be to prevent 'em wholly from aſſiſting in the defence of her Majeſty; and that wou'd be juſt as wiſe a Method to unite Churchmen with the Diſſenters in order to that defence, as it wou'd be to allude to the inſtructive Fable of 'Menenius Agrippa', to cut off one Hand to make t'other join with it to provide Neceſſarys for the Belly, becauſe ſome Quarrel had happen'd between 'em, which was the fitteſt for that Office. I ſuppoſe Joſhua

Ded. p. 4.

did

did not incapacitate the Gibeonites of all Honors and Privileges in the Jewish Nation, and make 'em Hewers of Wood and Drawers of Water, to unite 'em to that Nation, but to keep 'em a distinct and a separate People.

Thus it appears, that what Sir H. calls an Union between Churchmen and Dissenters, wou'd be more properly a Separation, and must necessarily alienate the Minds of the one from the other. But let us see, upon the Supposition that excluding Dissenters from Offices might be design'd to unite Churchmen and Dissenters, by what *means* he proposes that this Exclusion shall effect it, that so we may the better judg whether 'tis worth the while to make a trial. For some say that other Projects of Sir H's, that have had a specious appearance, have brought 'em under Disappointments for want of this Precaution. He is so pleasant in one place as to tell us, that the Exclusion of Dissenters from Offices (i. e. taking all Power from Dissenters, and putting it all into the hands of Churchmen) will promote this Union,

Ded. p. 2. § 1. ' by putting it out of the Power of the Church to pro-
' secute Dissenters:' And but the Line before, that it will promote it, ' by informing the Churchmen of the Extent of
' their Privileges:' As if they were ignorant of the Bounds of their Privileges at present, or as if the most exact Information cou'd have any tendency to promote this End. But when he is most in earnest, he seems to hope that excluding Dissenters will bring about this happy Conjunction, by fixing both their Eys intently upon defending

B. p. 10. § 4. her Majesty, and by removing Places, the golden Ball of Contention, out of the Dissenters sight, and the danger of the Church out of the Churchmens sight; and by putting it out of the power of the one to give, and of the other (viz. when they have no occasion) to take a Provocation which might dissipate their Thoughts, and divert

'em

'em from this ſteady view. And this I ſuppoſe Sir H. may mean, when he tells her Majeſty that 'inſtead of 'private Factions and Cabals, They (i. e. Churchmen and Diſſenters) 'will join in the defence of her Majeſty:' and in another place, 'that when Matters ſhall be thus 'happily ſettled, that both [i. e. Churchmen and Diſſenters] 'ſhall be ſecur'd from the danger of one and a-'nother——And when the Church ſhall have no power 'or provocation to promote a Proſecution of Diſſenters, '&c. then they will have no ground of Quarrel left on 'either ſide': and to this purpoſe he ſpeaks in other places. Ded. p. 4. Ded. p. 2. §. 1. B. p. 11. §. 6.

If then the Excluſion of Diſſenters from Offices is to effect this Union between Churchmen and Diſſenters, by *removing the Churchmens Fears and Provocations*; it muſt be made out (1) That theſe are the true Cauſes of the Diviſion. (2) That theſe are the only ones. (3) That this Excluſion wou'd remove thoſe Cauſes. Sir H. according to his uſual manner, has ſatisfy'd himſelf with aſſerting theſe Particulars; and till he proves 'em, our denying may go as far as his Aſſertion. However leſt our Word ſhou'd not be thought as good as his, (1) we ſhall ſhew preſently, that it is not probable that the Church have *any Fears* of the Diſſenters, ſince the Diſſenters are no ways dangerous. So that if ſhe has any Fears of 'em, they can be nothing but Vapors and Spleen, and therefore like thoſe that labor under that Diſtemper, muſt have ſome other Applications, than if ſhe had the real Diſeaſe which the Vapors counterfeit. Whence it follows, that if an Excluſion of Diſſenters be the proper Remedy for well-grounded Fears of the Church, it muſt be an improper one for thoſe that are but imaginary. And it is hard to gueſs what Sir H. means by the *Provocations* which the Diſſenters give the Church, unleſs he be ſo ill a Friend to the Church as to inſinuate, that ſhe is diſoblig'd by the Inve-

Inveteracy they diſcover to France, and the Duty they ſhew the Queen. Which I'm very apt to believe is a great provocation to ſome that aſſume and wou'd engroſs that Name: For this Behavior of the Diſſenters muſt needs incenſe them the more at preſent, ſince it muſt neceſſarily give the Diſſenters a great deal of Reputation, becauſe it can't be ſaid, as it was in the late Reign, that they are for continuing the War becauſe they are Courtiers, and wou'd flatter the Humor of a Warlike Prince, and live themſelves upon its Spoils.

But (2) if theſe were the Cauſes of the Diviſions among Churchmen and Diſſenters, they are *not all*, nor the *moſt conſiderable*. The Cauſes of the Diviſion between ſome that wou'd engroſs the Name of Churchmen and Diſſenters, is that the former wou'd graſp all the Places and Power of England, and perpetuate it in their own hands; that they wou'd either make all Diſſenters conform againſt their Conſciences, or loſe their Birthrights; and that the Diſſenters help the moderate Churchmen to ſhare the Dignitys and Power of England, and are protected by them from being perſecuted and oppreſs'd. So that 'tis in reality the want of Chriſtian Forbearance, and a Spirit of Selfiſhneſs and Envy, that are the chief if not the only Cauſes of our Diviſions. And theſe were the remote Springs of the Civil War, and not, as Sir H. B. p. 1. §. 3. pretends, 'the mixture and confuſion of Men of oppo-'ſite Principles in the ſame Adminiſtration': Now the proper Remedys for theſe Principles of Diſcord, are thoſe that wou'd introduce a Sufferance of one another, ſteady Aims at the Public Good, a Satisfaction to ſee it well ſerv'd, and an Impatience to ſee it diſſerv'd by any hands whatſoever. And the likelieſt method to cheriſh ſuch a happy temper among us, is an abſolute and complete Toleration by Law; and the Governments employing all men indifferently, according to their real Capacity for the Poſt,

Poſt, in which they are to ſerve. Thoſe like true Reſtoratives will give us the only Peace and Union that Freemen can wiſh for, or that it cou'd enter into her Majeſty's Heart, which is ſo entirely Engliſh, to recommend: Whereas we may eaſily gueſs what a Remedy the Excluſion of Diſſenters that Sir H. propoſes wou'd prove, ſince he's miſtaken in the nature of the Diſtemper, and his Medicines muſt, inſtead of removing the Cauſes of our Diviſions, encreaſe the preſent Malady, or turn it to a worſe.

Her Majeſty's Speech to her Parliament, Nov. 9. 1703.

But (3) if Sir H had hit upon the true Cauſes of our Diviſions, his *Application* wou'd have been *ineffectual*; ſince it does not ſo much as reach the Cauſes to which he aſcribes 'em. For they being principally, according to our Author, the Fears and Jealouſys of ſome Churchmen, that the Diſſenters may ſome time or other ruin the Church, the excluding 'em from Places will not wholly remove thoſe Fears and Jealouſys, unleſs they be confiſcated, baniſh'd, or impriſon'd: For their Freedom, Eſtates, and Numbers, will miniſter endleſs Jealouſys to melancholy men after being depriv'd of their public Employments.

But, tho an Excluſion of the Diſſenters from Offices be not the proper method to unite Churchmen and Diſſenters, yet poſſibly 'twill be ſaid, that 'tis a very likely way to *unite Churchmen amongſt themſelves.* And ſome of the Paſſages quoted under the other Head ſuit that Scheme ſo ill, and fall in ſo much eaſier with this, that I can't but fancy Sir H. had this Thought in his mind, by what unhappy accident ſoever it prov'd abortive. For certainly it wou'd be much more proper to ſay, that the Excluſion of Diſſenters wou'd unite all Churchmen, 'by 'taking away every Object of Jealouſy and Provocation 'that might divert their Thoughts from the defence of 'her Majeſty', than to ſay, that excluding of Diſſenters

wou'd tend to unite the Diſſenters with the Churchmen. That Excluſion having ſo direct a tendency to alienate their Minds from one another, and to make it wholly uſeleſs for them to turn their Thoughts upon her Majeſty's defence, and abſolutely neceſſary to divert them to contrive their own preſervation, from the greater dangers that ſuch unkind beginnings wou'd make 'em juſtly apprehend. I confeſs 'tis but ſeldom that I can hit upon ſuch a Scheme of Sir H's Thoughts, that ſome other Lines don't croſs and interſect. But if this be not Sir H's ſenſe, yet it being that which I am ſure will give his Argument the greateſt force, I hope he'l forgive me, if I conſider his Project as propos'd to unite Churchmen among themſelves, excluſive of an Union with the reſt of her Majeſty's Subjects.

But I muſt be ſo free with Sir H. as to ſay, that this excluſive Union wou'd be extremely *prejudicial* to the true Intereſt of the State. For it can ſerve nothing but a Party, and conſequently muſt needs diſſerve the whole. 'Tis plain, 'tis not an Union for the defence of her Majeſty, and the Service of our Country; for if it was, why ſhou'd it be propos'd excluſively of the Diſſenters, ſince none join more heartily for both thoſe Ends? And ſeeing this ſeparate Union is not intended for theſe Ends, it's a Conſpiracy and not an Union; for it can only confederate its Members in Villany, and ſtrengthen the Bands of Wickedneſs. Sir H. indeed thinks that what unites and ſerves the Sovereign and his three Eſtates, unites and ſerves the whole, becauſe he thinks they are the whole, and 'conſtitute the Body Politic of the Kingdom'. But how can about ſeven hundred Perſons be the whole Body Politic? I ſhou'd have thought, that the Body Politic had conſiſted, not only of thoſe that govern, but of thoſe that are govern'd. Five hundred and thirteen indeed repreſent the People of England,

Ded. p. 3. §. 1.

England, yet 'tis not impoſſible but they may have a ſeparate Intereſt from thoſe they repreſent. I ſuppoſe it won't be deny'd that the Houſe of Commons, in the times of the Civil War, had ſuch a ſeparate Intereſt, and in that Caſe they became but a Party: And when the Sovereign and Sir H's Three Eſtates paſs any Law to the prejudice of the Country, if they do it knowingly, their Laws then only ſerve an Intereſt different from that of the Public, and that I think is only the Intereſt of a Party. And I ſuppoſe no body will deny that ſeveral ſuch Laws have been made: Such were all the Penal Laws againſt Proteſtant Diſſenters, which ſerv'd no Intereſt but that of Papiſts and Bigots; and as ſuch they have been ſince ſuſpended. For if they had ſerv'd the common Intereſt, why were they not continued in full force? So that 'tis not always ſo ſafe nor ſo prudent 'for the Prince to con-'cur in all Methods which ſhall be at any time thought 'proper by Parliament to tranſmit the Church [or State] 'ſecurely ſettled to Poſterity,' as Sir H. wou'd fain have her Majeſty believe it is. The Parliament is indeed her Majeſty's great Council, yet our Conſtitution ſuppoſes that they may be in the wrong, and therefore has lodg'd a Negative Voice in the Sovereign, that ſhe may not be oblig'd to follow their Opinion blindly, but may have liberty to judg, whether what is propos'd be for the good, and agreeable to the Inclinations of the generality of the People, the only infallible Compaſs in ſuch a Government as ours, which ſhall never have any declination, and by which no Prince ſhall ever ſteer and miſcarry. Upon the whole then, notwithſtanding this Exception which Sir H. made to invalidate an Aſſertion (in Dr. Davenant's late Book) that carrys a very public Spirit in it, I can't but be of opinion, that this ſeparate Union cou'd be of no advantage but to Partys and private Men, and wou'd be highly diſſerviceable to the common

Ded. p. 2. §. 1.

Good. And indeed this Project taſts ſo much of a narrow Mind, and is ſo much below the comprehenſive views a Stateſman ought to have, that it ſeems only calculated for a Mine Adventure; where ſuch ſort of Maxims founded on theſe Principles, that the Governors of that Adventure conſtitute the whole Body of the Adventurers, and that nothing which promotes the Intereſt of the Governors, can leſſen the Intereſt of the others, may be of ſingular Advantage.

And conſidering that an Union among Churchmen excluſive of the reſt of her Majeſty's Subjects is ſo mean an End, ſo unworthy of an honeſt and skilful Politician, and which is ſo much to be dreaded rather than deſir'd; I muſt needs own that we are very much oblig'd to Sir H. for propoſing *Methods* that can never obtain it. And that it can never be obtain'd by theſe Methods, is evident from the ſame Reaſons from which it appear'd, that it cou'd never bring about an Union between Churchmen and Diſſenters. But as an Excluſion of Diſſenters from Offices wou'd alienate the minds of Diſſenters from the Churchmen, ſo if the ſeparate Union of Churchmen were a thing to be wiſh'd for, it wou'd only perpetuate greater Feuds and Diviſions among them, who wou'd then be leſs cautious, and more prone to fall into a thouſand leſſer Diſtinctions and Subdiviſions, as thinking them leſs dangerous to the Church, when the Diſſenters had no power to make their Advantage of 'em; and more neceſſary for the Security of the State, when the Diſſenters cou'd not be the Ballance in the Scale of Liberty, againſt thoſe that are for Arbitrary Power.

2. Thus we ſee that Sir H. does not ſeem to aim at an Union of all her Majeſty's Subjects, and that his Methods won't obtain it among any of them. And ſince all the other good Conſequences which are to flow from this Excluſion,

cluſion, are founded upon this imaginary Union, we may eaſily conclude how little of real Advantage we can receive from 'em. However that we may do Juſtice to Sir H's Argument, we'l conſider the other pretended Effects of this Union more particularly. Sir H 1ſt thinks that this Excluſion will procure us *a good Adminiſtration of our Laws:* and thinks that End can't be obtain'd, unleſs the Diſſenters by being excluded from all public Employments, may no longer be entruſted with the Guardianſhip and Execution of thoſe Laws, whoſe Intereſt it is to defeat and deſtroy 'em. And this is what I ſuppoſe he means, when he tells us, that the Queſtion is, 'Whether it is con- 'ſiſtent with the public Safety, to have ſome drawing 'one way, and ſome another, and thereby tearing the 'Government in pieces between 'em'. What Laws does Sir H. think they ought not to be entruſted with the execution of, upon the account of its being their Intereſt to defeat 'em? Is it the preſent Settlement, or the Proteſtant Succeſſion, the Aſſociation, Abjuration, or the Attainder of the pretended Prince of Wales? Or does Sir H. think, that if a Diſſenter was in the Treaſury, Cuſtoms, or Exciſe, that he muſt have any Intereſt to defeat the Laws that are made for the well regulating thoſe Revenues? So that it not being all Offices that cou'd ſo much as tempt a Diſſenter to defeat the Laws, if this prove any thing, it *proves not* that the Diſſenters ought to be excluded from all Offices, which is the Concluſion that Sir H. according to his looſe way of Reaſoning wou'd infer; but only that they ought to be excluded from thoſe particular Offices, which execute ſuch Laws as there is ſome pretence to think a Diſſenter has Intereſt to defeat.

B. p. 10.

B. p. 6. §. 4.

B. p. 4. §. 4.

It may be Sir H. will ſay, that in order to the due Adminiſtration of the Corporation and Teſt-Acts, and the Act of Uniformity, it is neceſſary that the Diſſenters

ſhou'd

ſhou'd be excluded from ſuch Offices, which are concern'd in ſeeing thoſe Laws duly executed. But neither will it prove that. As to the neceſſity of excluding the Diſſenters from thoſe Offices that relate to the Act of Uniformity, I ſhall conſider it when I come to prove, that the admiſſion of Diſſenters into Offices is not inconſiſtent with the Safety of the Church. I ſhall in the mean time only ſhew, that there is no neceſſity to exclude 'em from *thoſe Offices* that are concern'd in *executing the other two.* For if no Man might be entruſted with any Office, but he who had a ſteady Inclination to do every thing in that Office which the Law requir'd, we ſhou'd want as many Officers as we now do Places. I muſt needs ſay, I hope this Principle is not true, becauſe I think if it were, we might loſe a very able Commiſſioner of the Cuſtoms, if her Majeſty ſhou'd think fit to put Sir H. M. in that Commiſſion. For he cou'd hardly be thought a very fit Perſon to ſit at that Board, after the Addreſs he preſented to K James. And ſuppoſing it were true, how cou'd a high Churchman be fit for any Office, that is concern'd in executing the Act of Toleration? And why ſhou'd the high Churchmen be rather truſted with the execution of that Law, than a Diſſenter with the execution of the other two? I'm ſure the Act of Toleration is of much greater conſequence than the Corporation or Teſt Acts. For Papiſts might be excluded by other methods than ſuch as are provided by thoſe Laws: But nothing cou'd diſcharge the Duty of the Government to tender Conſciences, and quiet the Nation without an Indulgence. Our wiſe Conſtitution therefore has made another Proviſion for the due diſcharge of an Officer's Duty, beſides his Principles and private Perſwaſions. And inſtead of entruſting it to his Inclinations to execute the Laws, preſumes the diſcharge of their Duty from their fear to defeat 'em: And ſuppoſes Checks over Officers to awe 'em into

into their Duty, and a due courſe of Law by Information or Action to puniſh 'em for any neglect. There is therefore no abſolute neceſſity that every Officer ſhou'd have an Inclination to put all the Laws in execution: Or at leaſt there's no more neceſſity to exclude Diſſenters from Offices that relate to the execution of the Corporation and Teſt Acts leſt they ſhou'd be defeated, than to exclude high Churchmen from all Offices that relate to the execution of the Act of Toleration, leſt that ſhou'd be defeated.

The 2d Advantage conſequent to this Imaginary Union, is a vigorous *proſecution of the War.* A very odd way of proſecuting a War, to create uneaſineſs at home, and to hinder thoſe from giving any direction and aſſiſtance in its management, that neither want the Will nor the Power to do both. Ded. p. 4. B. p. 12. §. ult.

The 3d is *a Security to the Queen.* But certainly it can't be any Security to her Majeſty, by excluding a Body of honeſt men from all Places, to weaken her Government, to endanger and undermine it: And that at a time when the difficult Circumſtances of our Affairs make it neceſſary to employ all able Perſons for the execution of our Laws at home, and all Heads, all Hands, all Purſes too few for her Majeſty's defence abroad. B. p. 11. §. 7, 8, 9.

The 4th is a *Security to her Royal Proteſtant Succeſſors.* Indeed the Houſe of Hanover is extremely oblig'd to Sir H. for ſo admirable an Expedient for its Security as this muſt neceſſarily be, which diveſts thoſe men of all Power who have the firmeſt Reſolutions to uſe it to the Service of that Illuſtrious Family; which weakens an Intereſt that has never been ſuſpected of being falſe to the Oaths they have taken to maintain its Succeſſion, after her Majeſty and the Heirs of her Body; and which ſtrengthens a Party that has been unwillingly brought to ſwear to the Government ſince the Revolution, the only Baſis of the Proteſtant Succeſſion. B. p. 11. §. 7, 9.

The

Ded. p. 4. S. p. 12. The 5th is, that it will be a *Security to the Diſſenters*, of the continuance of their Toleration. A Diſſenter muſt have his Head very odly turn'd, who ſhou'd think the taking away a Right he enjoys by Law for the ſake of his conſcientious Diſſent, to be a method to ſecure it: Or that the Declaration of the Government, that a Diſſenter is not fit to be tolerated in a Place, was an Argument that they were thought fit to be tolerated out of one: Or that if they were deprived of all Civil Power, they ought thence to conclude, that they might be ſecure of their Eſtates: Or to add no more Abſurditys that a man muſt ſwallow to take in this Inference it muſt be an uncommon penetration that cou'd find out that the Toleration wou'd be inviolably maintain'd, by ſeeing that Intereſt weaken'd which ſupports the Toleration, and is ſupported by it; and by ſeeing the Power that's taken out of the hands of that Intereſt, given into theirs, who have brought on and promoted all the bitter Perſecutions in the preceding Reigns. I don't ſtand here to conſider the Reaſons Sir H. gives to prove theſe two laſt Aſſertions, becauſe they have been examin'd before.

Thus I hope it appears, that the admiſſion of Diſſenters into Offices, is not inconſiſtent with the Safety of the State. We will now conſider the more ſpecious Part of Sir H's Argument, and ſee *whether it is inconſiſtent with the Safety of the Church.* Sir H. has here again left us to gueſs at his meaning: But ſince nothing will help us to determine this Queſtion ſo clearly, as a diſtinct *Explication* of its *Terms*, I muſt beg leave to let my Reader know, that by the Church of England I mean a Society believing, or at leaſt owning thoſe of the Thirty-nine Articles that are Articles of Faith, and approving and acting

acting purſuant to thoſe that relate to Worſhip, Eccleſiaſtical Government and Diſcipline, to which certain Powers and Privileges are granted under the Sanction of our Laws. I deſire that it may be obſerv'd too, that under the Articles of the Church, which relate to Worſhip and Diſcipline, I include the Canons, the Book of Common Prayer, and of the Ordination of Prieſts and Deacons. Now this being the true Notion of the Church, as its danger muſt be either the deſtruction of theſe Articles; or if all are not in any danger, then the deſtruction of the moſt or of the beſt of the Articles, rather than the deſtruction of the feweſt or the leſs eſſential: So the Safety of the Church muſt conſiſt in a preſervation of all its Articles, or of the moſt and the beſt.

I know a great many People *mean ſomething elſe* by the Safety of the Church than the Security of its Articles: And when they ſay that the admiſſion of Diſſenters into Offices, is inconſiſtent with it, they wou'd have us underſtand that it is inconſiſtent with the preſervation of thoſe Tenents, which are either no part of the Articles at all, or of thoſe which are the leſs neceſſary, and perfectly accidental to Chriſtianity and true Religion: Such as the Divine Right of Epiſcopacy, the abſolute Neceſſity of an uninterrupted Succeſſion down from the Apoſtles, the Epiſcopal Form, together with the preſent Rites and Ceremonys of the Church, abſtracted from its Doctrine and Diſcipline, the expediency of encreaſing the number of its Rites and Ceremonys, its Union with the Gallican Church, its greater diſtance from Diſſenters, and its independency from the State, tho it have ſuch large Civil Privileges and Coercive Powers. Theſe men think the Church in no danger of any thing, but of a farther Reformation in its Conſtitution Worſhip and Diſcipline, and a more abſolute and impartial Toleration of thoſe that diſſent from it. To ſay the truth, I don't

Bp Parker's Account of the Govern. of the Chriſtian Church, p. 10. 66. *Dr. Heylins Life of A. L. and his Hiſt. of the Reform. Wolfſtript, Pref. Caſe of the Regale and Pontificat, p.* 179. §. 2. p. 101, 102, 224. §. 3. p. 214. §. 4. p. 240. n. XXII. De nuper. Schiſm. Anglic. Paræn. ad Exter. Sect 50, 54.

know but that the admiſſion of Diſſenters into Offices may be an improper means to preſerve theſe mens Church, tho I can't ſee how even this can ruin or deſtroy it. And this is the Church in the moſt, if not in every one of theſe Particulars, with which the Author of the Regale and the Pontificat thinks the admiſſion of Diſſenters to Offices inconſiſtent; and for whoſe ſake he propoſes that Excluſion of Diſſenters, which Sir H. endeavors to vindicate. I wou'd only obſerve this by the way, to ſhew that this Excluſion in the judgment of the Non-Jurors, is thought the propereſt Expedient to introduce their Popiſh Church. And if this be the Church, with whoſe preſervation Sir H. thinks the admiſſion of Diſſenters into Offices inconſiſtent, I wou'd not quarrel with him about the matter. But if he means, what he ſhou'd mean if he ſays any thing to the purpoſe, viz. that the admiſſion of Diſſenters into Offices is inconſiſtent with the preſervation of the moſt or the beſt of the Thirty nine Articles; and what the Church has own'd as their Conſequences, I wou'd fairly debate it with him according to his own wiſh with Reaſon and Moderation. I wou'd hope this is Sir H's Notion of the Church. If his Second underſtands him, it is: For he ſeems plainly enough by the Church to mean, the Church of England, as 'tis ſettled by the Act of Uniformity.

P. 180. §. 3.

Pref. p. 2. §. 3.

Peace and Union, or a Def. of Sir H's Treat. on the Occaſ. Confor. Bill, p. 3.

I. Now conſidering we have prov'd that the admiſſion of Diſſenters into Offices, is highly conſiſtent with the Safety of the State, and conducing to it, methinks none that pretends to wiſh well to the Church, *ſhou'd aſſert that they are inconſiſtent with her Intereſt.* For to aſſert that men that are in every Point true and ſubſervient to the Intereſt of the State are inconſiſtent with the Safety of the Church is confeſſing that the Church has an oppoſite Intereſt to the State, which is an acknowledgment that is not very likely to procure the Church many Friends, or much

Credit.

Credit. For 'tis plain and notorious, that Morality and true Religion is ſo much the Intereſt of the State, that no Man can be entirely an Enemy or a Friend to the one, but he muſt be ſo to the other. And if any thing ſhou'd be aſſerted, that ſuppoſes the Church to have an oppoſite Intereſt to the State, it muſt at the ſame time ſuppoſe, that the Church and Religion are two things of a quite different kind.

II. But were it not a very high Reflection on the Church, as it in reality is, to ſay, that its Intereſt and that of the State are oppoſite; yet I can't ſee, as Affairs ſtand at preſent, how the Diſſenters, whom we have prov'd to be true Friends to the State, *can be* any ways inconſiſtent with the Safety of the Church. For the Church's Danger is from the Enemys of the State. When the Government is ſubverted, 'tis not likely that ſhe ſhou'd ſtand; but till it is, ſhe will. She is ſo well ſecur'd by the Defence of the Laws and the number of her Members, that 'tis impoſſible for any thing but her own Strength turn'd upon her ſelf, or a Foreign Force to deſtroy her. How then can it be inconſiſtent with the Safety of the Church to give the Diſſenters any Civil Power, who wou'd uſe it to protect the Nation from its formidable Enemys of France and Rome? And to deprive 'em of all Civil and Military Power, leſt they ſhou'd uſe it againſt the Church, is altogether as abſurd and ridiculous, as if half a dozen able Mariners, who knew as well how to trim the Sails and ſteer the Veſſel, and were as forward to defend it againſt Enemys and Pirates as any of the others, and were very well affected to the Government and Orders of the Ship, but who ſhou'd happen to think that ſome better Perſon might be found to ſay Prayers, and that ſome better Compoſure, or ſome more proper Poſture might be us'd than thoſe that were agreed on by two thirds of the Complement,

ſhou'd be therefore thought ſo inconſiſtent with the continuation of thoſe Orders, that it ſhou'd be reſolv'd to clap 'em under Hatches for the ſecurity of thoſe Orders, rather than have their aſſiſtance in a Fight or a Storm to ſecure the Ship, and the method of that Solemnity too. So that unleſs thoſe that wiſh well to the only Support of the Church, and ill to its only dangerous Enemys, can deſtroy the Church, the Diſſenters, ſince they are the Churches Friends by means of being Friends to the State, can't be the Church's hurtful Enemys.

III. But as the Diſſenters are mediately its Friends, ſo neither are they *its immediate Enemys*. And when we ſhall have prov'd this, I think we ſhall have left it beyond diſpute, that the admiſſion of Diſſenters into Offices is not inconſiſtent with the preſervation of the Church.

1. And this will appear clearly if we conſider, That the Diſſenters are *Friends to the moſt and the beſt* of the Church's Articles. They own and believe Thirty ſix of 'em (a Line or two only excepted) with their Conſequences; which are not only by far the moſt in number, but the moſt neceſſary. For they with their Conſequences include the Doctrines deliver'd in the holy Scriptures, and in the Creeds of the Apoſtles, and of the Primitive Church. And 'tis by theſe the Church of England is what ſhe is, a ſound Chriſtian Church. 'Tis theſe that diſtinguiſh her from Atheiſts, Libertines, Deiſts, Socinians and Papiſts; whereas her Conſtitution, and her Rites and Ceremonys don't. For they might have, and ſome of 'em really have, what's very near to her Conſtitution and her Ceremonys, and yet remain Heretical or Antichriſtian: And had ſhe nothing beſides 'em, ſhe wou'd have remain'd ſo too. But as 'tis by her Doctrines ſhe's diſtinguiſh'd from theſe Enemys, ſo 'tis in theſe Doctrines they oppoſe her. And 'tis in theſe the Proteſtant Diſſenters agree with her, and deſire to join Forces for their defence; and wou'd

wou'd as gladly enter into any Meaſures and Combinations with the Churchmen, to endeavor by Example and Arguments, or any proper method of Perſuaſion to convince ſuch Gainſayers of the Truth, as they have chearfully join'd with 'em in Societys for promoting Chriſtian Knowledg, and Reformation of Manners. And wou'd the Church then declare War againſt the Diſſenters, who wou'd aſſiſt her to protect the Bible, and to recover the Diſcipline ſhe owns is wanting; and leave the one expos'd to the inſults of its numerous Enemys, and the other neglected, only to defend Ceremonys and Epiſcopacy, or rather their Impoſition?

2. Eſpecially wou'd the Church loſe Friends of ſuch importance, and treat 'em as Enemys, if ſhe conſiders, that as the Diſſenters are Friends to the moſt and to the beſt of the Articles, ſo if they are *Enemys* to any, 'tis *but to three* and a Line or two of a Fourth. 'Tis falſe therefore to ſay, that the Diſſenters are Enemys to the Church of England, and a miſtake in Fact as well as Reaſon to tell us, 'That an Excluſion of Diſſenters from the 'Adminiſtration of public Affairs is abſolutely neceſſary, 'becauſe they are ill-affected to the Church,' as Sir H. inſinuates. The moſt that can be poſſibly pretended, is, that they are Enemys to its Ceremonys, or to its Conſtitution, or rather to their Impoſition; without which ſhe wou'd continue to be the ſame ſound Proteſtant Church of England, as much as a Turk wou'd continue a Turk, tho he ſhou'd part with his Veſt, his Swaſh or his Turbant. Pref. p. 11. §. 1.

3. And then let it be farther conſider'd, that if they may in ſome ſenſe be ſaid to be Enemys to theſe, inaſmuch as they are againſt their Expediency or their Impoſition, yet they are not againſt other mens uſing 'em, or ſubmitting to 'em when Impos'd. They are as much *againſt forcing* other men to abſtain from the uſe of indifferent things,

things, or of things impoſs'd in the Worſhip of God, as they are unwilling to be forc'd to a Compliance with 'em themſelves. Theſe are the Principles of that Toleration which they deſire and defend: Nor are they ſo narrow ſpirited, as when they talk for a Toleration, only to mean their own. Indeed Sir H. tells us, that they did not tolerate others when they had the Power. He ſays, 'they kept 'the Power in their own hands'; and I ſuppoſe means, that upon the account of Religious Differences, they kept it out of the hands of others. If they did, I'm ſure they did not underſtand their own Principles, or acted contrary to 'em. And I hope they are better acquainted with 'em at preſent, and will hardly act in contradiction to 'em for the future. If they never learnt the Principles of an abſolute and impartial Toleration before, one may very well imagine, they were taught it by their uſage in ſome late Reigns. And a freſh Inſtance makes it reaſonable for us to believe it: They having at the Inſtance of the Quakers, in behalf of their Friends in New England, whom they repreſented to ly under ſome hardſhips there, declar'd, That 'tis their Opinion that the Quakers ſhou'd not be liable to any Penaltys on the account of their peaceable diſſent from the way of Worſhip eſtabliſh'd in that Colony. A piece of Juſtice due to them, not only as they came under the Character of perſecuted Men; but as they have done eminent Service to Mankind, in aſſerting ſuch large Principles of Toleration, as ſeem calculated more for the Good of the whole humane Race, than the mere Advantage of their own Party: Tho at the ſame time none are greater Enemys to the Tenents of the Quakers, nor greater Friends to the eſtabliſh'd Worſhip of that Plantation, than the Presbyterians and the Independents to whom they apply'd. And ſince the Adverſarys of the Nonconformiſts are often inferring their perſecuting Principles, from the pretended great Severity

Pref. p. 2. §. 2.

us'd

us'd againſt the Epiſcopal Diſſenters in Scotland by the Eſtabliſh'd Church of that Kingdom: Let 'em by the ſame way of Deduction conclude, from an unparallel'd Inſtance of Moderation in the laſt General Aſſembly of that Nation, that the Proteſtant Diſſenters have entertain'd larger Principles of late: That National Synod having unanimouſly voted, 'That all Miniſters Epiſcopally ordain'd, 'who will but ſubſcribe the Articles of Faith, and own 'the Presbyterian Government of the Church to be in 'Fact the Eſtabliſh'd Government there, leading an un-'blamable Life and Converſation, ſhall be capable of all 'Eccleſiaſtical Preferments'. From theſe Inſtances the Adverſarys of the Diſſenters may fairly conclude, that whatever men of their Denomination have practis'd formerly, yet they wou'd be as far from perſecuting the Church for her Conſtitution and way of Worſhip now, were it in their Power to do it, as they are unwilling to be hardly dealt with for theirs.

4. But the Diſſenters are not barely for tolerating the belief of theſe three Articles and a half, and of their Conſequences, but are for *holding Communion* with the Church that believes them, and acts accordingly. There might be indeed ſome pretext for ſaying, that wild Sectarys and Enthuſiaſts were Enemys to the Church: But what color is there for making ſuch a Charge againſt men, who not only agree with the Church in a common Rule, and upon their own Principles muſt be for tolerating her in thoſe things wherein they differ, but maintain Communion with her notwithſtanding thoſe Differences? The Church has all the Security that theſe men are not her Enemys, that either common Faith or the Sacramental Pledg can give.

5. And ſure ſhe'll believe *Experience*, if ſhe won't believe them. Let her conſult the Hiſtory of the Reigns of K. Charles, K. James, and K. William, and let her try

to

to find any Inſtance of the Diſſenters endeavouring her ruin, beſides the lawful and open Attempts which they made upon all occaſions after a further Reformation of the Church, and a more compleat Toleration of Diſſenters, which indeed ſome men perhaps think the greateſt damage the Church can ſuſtain. In the mean time I hope they'll allow, that the Diſſenters were ſo far from endeavouring to deſtroy the Church in the Reign of King James, as to lay aſide all attempts even of Reparation and Revenge, and forgetting private Intereſt and Injurys, cou'd neither be brought into the Deſigns of deſtroying the Church, nor be hinder'd from giving her all the aſſiſtance that was in their power.

IV. Thus it appears, that the Diſſenters are Friends to the Church, both in Fact and in Principle. But let us now enquire whether the admiſſion of Diſſenters to Offices wou'd be inconſiſtent with the Safety of the Church, upon the *Suppoſition* that they were its Enemys. And even upon that Suppoſition, it does not neceſſarily follow, that they ought to be depriv'd of all Power in the State, becauſe the Power of ſome Enemys is uſeful. And if the Diſſenters, tho Enemys, ſhou'd appear to be Enemys of that ſort, the weakning 'em wou'd prove the ruin of the Church. The overthrow of Carthage, Rome's greateſt Rival, was the deſtruction of Rome. And England and Holland ſmart in this Age for their ill Policy in ſuffering Spain their formidable Enemy to be reduc'd ſo low in the laſt. The Power the Diſſenters have in England is of the ſame uſe to the Church, that the Power of Carthage was to Rome, or that the Power of Spain wou'd have been to our own Country and the United Provinces, had we maintain'd it againſt France, when we ſaw it ſo far declin'd. For the Power and Intereſt the Diſſenters have, and are capable of having in England, cements the Church, and *ſecures it from the*

Attempts of worse Enemys. For whilst the Dissenters have Power, they will curb the Designs of those who wou'd go upon the Cassandrian Principles, and revive the Project of Arch-Bishop Laud; and who in order to it, talk of deciding Controversys between Protestants and Papists, in an Universal Council of Popish and Reformed Divines; who wou'd patch up an Union with the Gallican Church, commence a Persecution upon Dissenters, and who affect an independency of the Church of England from the Civil Power. These are the Formidable Enemys of the Church of England, who wou'd subvert her Constitution, and the Protestant Religion at the same time. But whilst the Dissenters have any Power, they will divert these men from their Attempts, or render them unsuccessful. So that since the Church is in more danger of being ruin'd by these men, who call themselves High Churchmen (but are nothing more than Ceremony-mongers) than by the Dissenters; and that the Dissenters can no longer help to ballance 'em when they are excluded from all Offices, and depriv'd of all Power; the Effect of such a Deprivation will be, that the true Church of England will find her self overballanc'd and ruin'd by them. And what mistaken Policy wou'd it be then in the Church to divest the Dissenters of all Offices, tho it did appear that they were its Enemys?

De nuper. Schism. Anglic. Paræn. ad Exter. Sect. 55. *Case of the Regale and Pontificat*, p. 224. §. 3. p. 214. §. 4. p. 255, 256. 179. §. 2.

But the Power and Interest of the Dissenters is useful to the Church, by being a *Check* upon *her* own *Members*, as well as upon her Enemys. The Jealousys of the several Professors and Pretenders to Religion, has been one of the greatest means God's Providence has made use of to perpetuate the Purity of Religion in its different Dispensations from Adam down to his Posterity in all Ages. And 'tis the Fears and Jealousys which the Church has of the Dissenters, that animate its Members to unite amongst themselves, and incite 'em from a no-

ble emulation to be more exemplary in their Lives, and to make greater advances in uſeful Learning. But were there no ſuch ſeparate Bodys, whoſe Reproach the Church fear'd, and whom ſhe did not ſuſpect of any Deſigns to take the advantage of Indecencys and Diviſions, 'tis to be fear'd, that as Rome fell into Diſorders and Factions at the deſtruction of Carthage; and as it happens to all Aſſemblys and Societys, whoſe Unanimity depends upon the Wiſdom and Authority of their own Members, rather than of their Orders and Conſtitution, ſo the Church wou'd fall into groſs Ignorance, more Hereſys, a greater diſſolution of Manners, remiſsneſs of Diſcipline, and into innumerable Partys and Diviſions. If the Church therefore wou'd keep Diſputes and Animoſitys from entring her own Doors, ſhe muſt ſuffer 'em to live between her and the Diſſenters; as the Senate of Venice does the trifling Quarrel among the common People, Which are the better men, they that live on one ſide a Canal, or they that live on the other, under the Factions of the 'Caſtellani and Nicolotti', to prevent them from falling into thoſe, that wou'd relate to the Conſtitution. Since the Church then, to ſum up this head, is in infinitely greater danger of ruining her ſelf than being ruin'd, nothing can be poſſibly ſo fatal to her, as to rob the Diſſenters of that Power, the Fear whereof is the beſt Preventive of the Ruin which the Church ought chiefly to apprehend.

Ville & Republique de Venise par le Sieur de St. Dedier. chap. dern.

V. But if the Diſſenters are not ſerviceable, yet will it not be worth the while to exclude 'em from all Offices and public Employments, unleſs they are *dangerous*. But that they can never be, if we conſider the ways by which the Diſſenters can do any hurt or danger to the Church, which are three; Force, Trick, and Legal Alterations.

1. It

1. It can't be ſuppos'd, that the Proteſtant Diſſenters, who are not one third of England, can ever ſubvert the Church *by Force*, who are twice the number. Eſpecially if we conſider, that they neither depend upon any Foreign Power as the Papiſts do, nor are well united amongſt themſelves as the Quakers. It can neither be ſuppos'd, that the Diſſenters, who are ſuch Friends to the Libertys of England, ſhou'd ever call in a Foreign Aid to deſtroy the Church; or that they who never agreed amongſt themſelves for their own Security, ſhou'd ever be able to conſpire and bring about the Ruin of an Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, which has all the Defence the Laws can give it.

2. Nor can they ever *defeat* thoſe *Laws* by being in Offices, and having the execution of thoſe Laws committed to 'em; how much ſoever Sir H. may think 'hindring 'the Diſſenters from getting into public Employments a 'proper method to tranſmit the Church ſecurely ſettl'd 'to Poſterity'. For there are but very few Diſſenters among the Gentry or Profeſſions (if we'll believe Dr. Davenant, who has great skill in numbring the People) and conſequently but a very few capable of public Employments: And amongſt thoſe that are capable, there will be a ſmaller number ever employ'd, conſidering that the diſpoſal of Places muſt, according to our Laws, be always in the hands of a Member of the Eſtabliſh'd Church. And how many watchful *Eyes* will there be conſtantly upon theſe *few inconſiderable* Officers, to prevent 'em from defeating the Laws, or doing any thing to the detriment of the Church? Or if they ſhou'd not be prevented, how open and *eaſy* will the *Remedys* ly againſt them, which are provided againſt Officers, that fail in the diſcharge of their Duty? And this ſingle Conſideration ſeems ſufficient by Sir H's own confeſſion to quiet the Fears and Jealouſys of thoſe that are Members of

Ded. p. 2. §. 1.

Eſſays upon Peace and War, Part I. P. 248.

the Church of England, ſince he tells her Majeſty, that
Ded. p. 2. §. 1. 'they are in a fair way of being determined by her Majeſty's Gracious Speech, That her Majeſty will always 'make it her particular care to encourage and maintain 'the Church of England as by Law eſtabliſh'd.

And, why ſhou'd the Government think it *more dangerous* to the Church to entruſt the Diſſenters with the execution of the Laws, becauſe of their differing from the Church in ſome Points, than to entruſt thoſe who mightily affect the name of Churchmen, but differ from it in others? What reaſon is there to apprehend greater Alterations to the Church, by entruſting the execution of the Laws with thoſe that are for leſſening the number of Ceremonys, than with thoſe that wou'd encreaſe 'em? With thoſe that are for no human Impoſitions, or thoſe that are againſt a Toleration? With thoſe that only mind the Doctrin and Diſcipline of the Church, or thoſe that are concern'd about nothing but its Ceremonys and Conſtitution? With thoſe who wou'd have it comprehend and take in ſome of the Proteſtant Diſſenters, or thoſe that wou'd unite the Church of England with the Popiſh Church of France? Or, laſtly, with thoſe who wou'd have the Church have no Powers, but ſuch as are diſtinct from thoſe of the State, and which no State lays claim to; or thoſe who wou'd have the Church retain all its Powers, and acquire an independency from the Civil Government? Since there's no danger fear'd from theſe Church Diſſenters, nor no Excluſion of them attempted, tho the Alterations they wou'd introduce, are infinitely more dangerous and more likely than thoſe the others are ſuppos'd to aim at, 'tis certain, that the danger of Alterations by the Diſſenters defeating the Laws, how well ſoever it may ſerve for a Pretence, cannot be the reaſon of their Excluſion.

3. But

3. But tho theſe are the only dangers the Church can fear from the Diſſenters, whilſt the Laws continue as they are, yet the moſt ſpecious Pretence of danger is the Alterations ſhe may apprehend from a number of Diſſenters in the Legiſlature, who might get it into their power to *alter the Laws*, that ſettle her Conſtitution or ſecure it. Poſſibly this is the Power to deſtroy the Eſtabliſh'd Church, which Sir H. might have in his Eye, when he ſays, 'that the Diſſenters who contend for any thing 'more than Liberty of Conſcience' (from which he always takes great care to ſeparate the Liberty of enjoying a Place) 'are contending for'. And indeed as Legal Alterations are the only Alterations the Diſſenters have the inclination to attempt, ſo they are ſuch as the Church neither pretends nor deſires to be exempt from. If ſhe had, ſhe had precluded her ſelf from the Benefit ſhe thinks ſhe has receiv'd from the Act of Uniformity in 62. And wou'd preclude her ſelf from any other Alteration, which the Wiſdom of the Nation may think for her Advantage. Perhaps indeed it may be ſaid, that ſhe wou'd ſecure her ſelf againſt any Alterations that a majority of Diſſenters in Parliament cou'd be ſuppos'd to make. But there is ſo inconſiderable a number of Diſſenters among the Nobility, Gentry, or Profeſſions, and conſequently ſo very few that are ever likely to come into Parliament, that the danger that can be fear'd from their Parliamentary Alterations, is but barely poſſible, and therefore what no wiſe man ſhou'd provide againſt. But if there were any real danger from hence as there is in a manner none at all, yet if this were the only danger the Church was in from the Diſſenters, ſhe wou'd be in no danger of any Alterations, but *ſuch as all Conſtitutions* muſt be in in a Free Government. And if ſhe deſires a Security againſt Parliamentary Alterations, ſhe deſires a greater Security than our Civil Conſtitution either has;

B. p. 3. §. 5.

or is capable of having. Our Government precludes it ſelf from no Parliamentary Alterations, becauſe it ſuppoſes that thoſe Alterations will be for the good, and agreeable to the Inclinations of the People; or elſe that the Alterations will not continue. The Church has this Security as much as the State: And methinks 'tis unworthy of any Churchman to diſcover the fears of ſuch Alterations from the Diſſenters, as ſhall be agreeable to the majority of the Repreſentatives, and of thoſe they repreſent. But if the Church had a mind to be ſecur'd againſt Parliamentary Alterations, to exclude the Diſſenters from Offices, and thereby in a good meaſure from Parliament, wou'd, inſtead of giving the Church that Security, *leave her the more expos'd.* She wou'd then lie open to all the Alterations of the High Churchmen, whereas the beſt Security our Conſtitution can poſſibly give her againſt any Alterations whatſoever, is to ballance the Power of the Diſſenters and the High Flyers; and by keeping both in Offices, or at leaſt both capable of 'em, to keep one a conſtant check upon the other.

VI. But let us put the Caſe yet farther. Let us ſuppoſe the Diſſenters no Friends to the Church, either by ſerving her or the State; nay, let us ſuppoſe 'em prejudicial and dangerous Enemys; and ſtill it will not follow, that the admiſſion of Diſſenters to Offices, is inconſiſtent with the Safety of the Church, becauſe reſtraining 'em from Offices by preventing Occaſional Conformity, will be *ineffectual to ſecure* the Church, and will really endanger it. If reſtraining 'em from Offices wou'd ſecure the Church, it muſt do it either by drawing the Diſſenters over to the Church, or by diveſting 'em of all Power if they keep at their preſent diſtance. But it will do neither.

1. When I ſay that reſtraining the Diſſenters from Offices, won't bring the Diſſenters over to the Church,

I mean, that it won't bring over any to *profeſs* the Eſtabliſh'd way of Worſhip: The Diſſenters ſtood the ſhock of a long Perſecution, and ſuffer'd many Penaltys, which were not to be avoided but by profeſſing the National Religion, rather than be brought to make that Profeſſion. But the incapacitating a Man for an Office only for going to a Meeting, is not ſo much as calculated to make men profeſs themſelves to be Churchmen. It can only hinder 'em from being Diſſenters, whilſt it leaves 'em at liberty to be Libertines, Deiſts or Atheiſts, if they pleaſe.

But, if an Incapacity for all Employments upon going to a Meeting, ſhou'd prove more effectual to make men take up the Profeſſion of the Eſtabliſh'd way of Worſhip than Fines and Impriſonments, what Service in the next place cou'd a bare Profeſſion of the Eſtabliſh'd way of Worſhip do the Church, unleſs Conviction attended it? The Church cou'd expect no Strength, Friendſhip or Obedience from men, that were brought into it by the Fears of Loſs, or the Hopes of Gain: If any men cou'd ſupport the Church, but thoſe that come into it freely and of their own accord, the Church and Religion muſt be different things. For if it can be ſuppos'd, that the Church cou'd be ſerv'd by Hypocriſy, I think there's no need to prove that Religion can't. And 'tis impoſſible that excluding the Diſſenters from Offices *ſhou'd alter their Opinions*, or win their Affections. Since we have prov'd this Excluſion to be a Penalty, and have brought ſeveral Arguments to ſhew, that Penaltys can't convince, and have had Sir H's concurrent Opinion for it. Part I. p. 21—27. 34—37.

2. And as this Excluſion can't ſecure the Church by encreaſing its own Strength, ſo neither can it ſecure her by *weakning her Enemys*. For if the Diſſenters evade the Laws in being, as is pretended, and get into Places

Places by Hypocriſy, and the preventing Occaſional Conformity is deſign'd to reſtrain 'em from Offices, only by preventing that Hypocriſy by which they evade the Corporation and Teſt Acts; what ſhall prevent 'em by ſome new invented Trick to evade any Act, that ſhall oblige Officers to conſtant Conformity? Nor will it be more difficult for a Hypocrite to evade that Teſt, than it was to evade the other. If the Diſſenters wou'd conform occaſionally for the benefit of a Place againſt their Conſciences, as 'tis pretended they have done, what ſhou'd prevent 'em from conforming conſtantly for the ſame End, when Conſtant Conformity ſhall ſtand in the ſame place that Occaſional Conformity does now? Hypocrites ſeldom know where to ſtop, and a debauch'd Conſcience proceeds from one violation of its Integrity to a greater. And there's no queſtion to be made, but that (ſuppoſing Diſſenters get into Places by Hypocriſy now) if conſtant Conformity had been made the Teſt, there wou'd have been the ſame reaſon to complain of 'em for not refuſing it, and thereby keeping out others; as Sir H's Second pretends the Diſſenters 'think they have to complain of the Church-men, for not refuſing the Aſſociation, and the Abjuration of the pretended Prince of Wales'. For that Author makes the Occaſional Conformity Bill a Reprizal upon the Diſſenters for the other two. And in that I believe he ſpeaks the Senſe of a great many beſides himſelf. Thus it appears that reſtraining Diſſenters from Offices by preventing Occaſional Conformity, if they are Hypocrites, will not prevent the Miſchief, and will encreaſe the Diſſimulation 'tis deſign'd to cure: And inſtead of hindring Mens being Hypocrites occaſionally, will make 'em conſtantly ſo.

Def. of Sir H. M's Treat. of Occaſ. Conform. p.10.

VII. But upon the Suppoſition, that the Diſſenters are dangerous Enemys to the Church, reſtraining 'em from Offices, will not only fail of ſecuring the Church, but

endanger

endanger it extremely. 1. For it will alarm and cement the Diſſenters, who are in a great meaſure ſecure and divided. Such a Perſecution muſt needs unite 'em in more prudent Meaſures and a more ſteddy Application to obtain better Securitys for their future Eaſe and Protection. And as ſuch a breaking in upon the Toleration will *ſtrengthen the Diſſenting*, ſo it will neceſſarily *weaken the Proteſtant Intereſt* both at home and abroad; the only Security the Church of England has againſt Rome, its implacable Enemy. And inſtead of engaging all that wiſh well to the Reform'd Intereſt every where to join in the defence of their common Cauſe, 'twill introduce and increaſe Partys and ſeparate Intereſts, Fears and Jealouſys, Envys and Hatreds, Strife and Contention, and every evil Work. And the Effect of all this muſt be, that inſtead of forming a ſtrong Body to oppoſe the combin'd Force of our common Enemys, we ſhall firſt divide into ſmall Squadrons, and engage ſo warmly in our own Factions, as to ſave our Enemys the Expence of a Victory.

2. No likelier Method cou'd be poſſibly thought of by the greateſt Enemy of the Church to deſtroy its Ceremonys, than to enrage and exaſperate the Diſſenters; nor to deſtroy its Doctrine, than to make her cut her ſelf off from the Aſſiſtance of Proteſtants abroad, unleſs it be the putting her upon Methods that will *impair the internal Strength* of the Church, and even that this Excluſion of Diſſenters cannot fail to do. Becauſe it will rob the Church of the Credit ſhe has acquir'd by her late Moderation. For when ſhe once begins to leave Arguments and good Examples, the proper Armour and Artillery of Truth, for Severity and Hardſhips, the only Recourſe of Miſtake and Falſhood; all men will begin to ſuſpect, that either the Church has not the right ſide of the Controverſy, in thoſe Points for which ſhe perſecutes the Nonconfor-

miſts, or that her Clergy want the Zeal to promote the Truth by a due diſcharge of their Paſtoral Care. For where ſhe comes recommended by due Inſtruction and a good Example, Force and Perſecution is not only needleſs, but prejudicial. Our Saviour makes no Conqueſts but by the Sword that proceeds out of his Mouth; and to make Converts by any other, is much more agreable to the Character and Doctrines of a bloody Mahomet and Antichriſt, than of the Prince of Peace.

3. When the Church ſhall by theſe means have loſt the Character of Truth in her differences with the Proteſtant Diſſenters, and of a good Temper, it won't be ſtrange if ſhe ſhou'd *loſe* a great many of her preſent *Members*, and of thoſe ſhe might reaſonably hope to *proſelyte* by the help of Occaſional Conformity for the future. For as few People on the one hand take in thoſe Principles, by which conſtant Conformity can appear unlawful to an Occaſional Conformiſt, for reaſons which we have given before, upon which account this Practice muſt needs increaſe her Numbers: So on the other hand, men are generally brought to deſert a perſecuting Communion, not only by thoſe Imperfections in that Society which generally make it neceſſary to commence a Perſecution, and the juſt Reſentment they have againſt men that commence it, but from thoſe Vertues which a Perſecution generally begets in them that are perſecuted, and the Pity that inſpires generous Breaſts towards men that are hardly us'd.

Part I. p. 19.

4. If then the Church wou'd continue upon the foot ſhe is at preſent, ſhe ought carefully to avoid the reducing the Diſſenters to Extremitys; and ſhou'd give 'em ſuch Treatment, as the Senate of Rome reſolv'd to give the Privernates, after a ſolemn Debate upon the matter, viz. ſuch as may ſatisfy them, and which they mayn't find it their Intereſt to alter. For that Ambaſſador of the Privernates, who being ask'd by the Conſul, 'if the Ro-

Liv. l. 8. c. 21.

'mans

'mans ſhou'd give 'em Terms, whether they wou'd 'not break 'em? reply'd, that they never wou'd, if 'they were reaſonable, but as ſoon as they cou'd, if 'unreaſonable,' ſpoke the ſenſe of all Mankind when in the ſame Circumſtances. If the Church ſhou'd make the Conditions of Peace with the Diſſenters ſtrait and ſevere, ſhe will loſe her Reputation; the loſs of Reputation will be attended with the loſs of her Members, as we have juſt now remark'd; and the loſs of them will endanger her *Privileges and Powers:* Which People will be apt to grudg her, and be willing to let thoſe ſhare (for their better Security) whom ſhe wou'd oppreſs. It was the fury of the Sectarys that procur'd the Church her Eſtabliſhment at the Reſtoration; and the Perſecutions of the Church that procur'd the Diſſenters their Toleration at the Revolution. Such is the Courſe of things, and of mens Paſſions. They run from one Extreme to the other, and a diſpoſition to Reparation and Pity generally ſucceeds to a fit of Injuriouſneſs and Rage.

From what has been hitherto ſaid, one may naturally draw theſe two Conſequences. Firſt, that if the Diſſenters wou'd have acted as Party-men, and have only conſulted their private Intereſt, they muſt have *gladly ſeen* the *Occaſional Conformity Bill paſt* into a Law, and ſuffer'd it to have gone thro the Houſes quietly, without any oppoſition. For it wou'd have prevented a Practice that will weaken their Party, and have brought on a Perſecution that muſt have done it conſiderable Service. But they gave the greateſt Demonſtrations of a Mind well-affected to their Country and of a truly public Spirit, in forgoing ſuch narrow Advantages rather than ſee an Expedient loſt, that is the likelieſt of any within our view, to extirpate Faction in Church and State; and in reſolving to bear Reproaches from Party-men and Bigots of all ſides, before they wou'd be wanting in any Endeavors

to keep a door open, by which honeſt men of all denominations enter public Poſts and each others Communion.

The other is an Anſwer to a Queſtion that may ariſe from what we have ſaid. For poſſibly it may be ask'd after all this, *What Courſe muſt be taken* with the Diſſenters, ſince excluding 'em all Offices can be neither ſerviceable to Church nor State, and muſt prove prejudicial to 'em both? Herennius Pontius being ask'd by his Country-men the Samnites, how they ſhou'd uſe the Roman Army when they had it in their power, having block'd it up in the Straits of Caudium, ſent 'em two Anſwers: 'Firſt, that they ſhou'd let 'em all go, and 'afterwards that they ſhou'd not let a Man eſcape. I wou'd make a like Reply. Either deal with the Diſſenters as true Friends to the Church and State, or as dangerous Enemys. If they ſhall be thought dangerous, they ought to be ſecur'd and diveſted of all manner of Power whatſoever, and to be confiſcated, baniſh'd, and proſcrib'd. But if they are true Friends, let 'em be impartially treated, and have the ſame Protection and Countenance with other Subjects. And then being Friends to the Government in Principle, Paſſion cou'd not make 'em its Enemys. But Principle and Intereſt both concurring, muſt make 'em as true to the Government, as any Conformiſt whatſoever. But to deal with 'em in ſome Inſtances as Friends, and in others as Enemys; to diveſt 'em of ſome Power, and not of all, is to provoke 'em to contrive illegal Methods, and to leave 'em ſtrength enough to put 'em in execution. This miſtaken Policy was the Samnites Ruin, and muſt be ours, if the Diſſenters were not better Chriſtians and better Subjects than ſome are willing to repreſent 'em.

Liv. l. 9. c. 3.

By

By this time I promise my self, that 'tis very evident there's no reason to incapacitate the Dissenters for all Offices, because that admitting 'em to Offices wou'd be inconsistent with the Safety of the Church and State. We'll now proceed to examine Sir H's second Argument, and see whether '*The Admission of Dissenters to Offices be* '*inconsistent with the Practice of all wise Governments in* '*the World*, and of those very Countrys in particular, 'that give the greatest Indulgence to tender Consciences.' Which Sir H. affirms, and from thence concludes, that we ought to incapacitate the Dissenters for all Offices, in imitation of their Example. B. p. 1. §. 1. p. 4. §. 3.

I. But two things go to make an Example; the Truth of the Fact, and the reason of that Fact's holding in the case in which 'tis propos'd to our Imitation. But it falls out unhappily for Sir H's Argument, that neither of these are to be found in the case before us. And if this can be made out, I suppose this Argument will be thought sufficiently answer'd.

1. *The Fact is not true*, that all wise Governments have preserv'd the public Administration in the hands of Persons of one and the same Persuasion in matters of Religion. Many Instances have been produc'd to the contrary out of antient and modern Story. And it has been prov'd beyond dispute, that admitting Dissenters to the highest Posts in Camps and Councils, has been a thing frequently and advantageously practis'd in the Egyptian, Assyrian, Median, Persian, Grecian, and Roman Monarchys, and in the Jewish Nation: And that it continues to be the Custom in several Electorates, distinct Sovereigntys, and free Citys of the German Empire; in Bohemia, Hungary, Scotland, and the United Provinces *. *Moderat. a Vertue, p. 35. ad ult. A Letter to Sir H. concerning his Treatise about Occas. Conform. by J. Lacy, Esq; p. 5. Peace without Union, p. 2, 3, 4, 5.*

2. Sir

* I chose to refer to the Instances of admitting Dissenters to all Offices that are

2. Sir H. has indeed prudently limited his Aſſertion to modern Times, to general Caſes, ordinary Occaſions, and to Countrys that have eſtabliſh'd a national Religion by Acts of Uniformity, as in this Kingdom. He *propoſes* his Aſſertion and Exceptions in the firſt and ſecond Paragraphs in this manner : 'All wiſe Nations in the 'World, even thoſe who give the greateſt Indulgence to 'Conſciences truly ſcrupulous, how different ſoever 'their Conſtitution of Government may be in other re-'ſpects (and here by the way, notwithſtanding, or ſome word of like ſignification is left out, or elſe the Conſtruction will be thus, how different ſoever) 'whatever 'has bin practis'd in antient Times, in particular Caſes, 'or on extraordinary Occaſions,' &c. And a little after he adds, 'And where a national Church has been eſta-'bliſh'd by Acts of Uniformity as in this Kingdom, &c. I'm very glad that where Sir H. has ſo little

B. p. 1, §. 1, 2.

---

are produc'd in thoſe Treatiſes, rather than to quote them or add many others my ſelf, that I mayn't take up my Readers time with what they may have ſeen on this Subject before, and that they may be the better ſatisfy'd in the Authority of theſe Examples, than they can be in any new ones; ſince neither Sir H. who has wrote ſince Moderation a Vertue *came out, nor any of the Pamphlets that have appear'd in anſwer* to that, or to the Letter to Sir H. *or* Peace without Union, *pretend to deny 'em to be matters of Fact. So that I'll add but a few Obſervations.*

The Jewiſh Nation had a Conſtitution which was deſign'd for no other end, than to raiſe Expectations in the World of the Coming of the Meſſiah, and to prepare things ſo for his Coming, that he might be known when he came : And therefore no Precedents for ſecluding Laws that cou'd be brought from a Government erected for ſo peculiar an end, can recommend 'em to other Governments that are eſtabliſh'd for the Advantage of the Community, and for its Enlargement and Increaſe. But yet even this Conſtitution admitted the numerous Sect of the Sadduces and the Eſſenes to ſhare the moſt conſiderable Employments (as appears by the Writings of Joſephus and the Evangeliſts) tho they differ'd from the Body of the Nation in their Sentiments of Religion. It appointed no Shibboleth to be pronounc'd by the Sadduces or the Eſſenes, before they ſhou'd be admitted into public Offices and Employments : and when they compel'd their Neighbours the Idumæans to a total Conformity, they ſmarted ſeverely for it. For by that means they pav'd the way to the Royal Power of Herod (whoſe Father was an Idumæan) who prov'd ſo great a Tyrant, that

tle Reaſon on his ſide, as he has here, he neglects Grammar and Propriety of Speech. For that gives me hopes, that the many Inſtances of falſe Reaſonings which abound in his Treatiſe, various and numerous enough to furniſh a Syſtem of Logics with examples of Sophiſms and Paralogiſms of all kinds, are rather owing to the Haſt occaſion'd by Sir H's Zeal to appear ſeaſonably in the defence of the Occaſional Bill, than to that want of Capacity or Integrity, which one might ſuſpect in any but a man of Sir H's Character and Reputation. And there's nothing gives me any difficulty in putting this Interpretation upon it, unleſs it be, that he has not corrected the falſe Engliſh

---

that they reſolv'd never to admit any Proſelytes, who did not evidence the greateſt Freedom in their Conformity. As appears from their Talmudical Rules.

Julian the Apoſtate excluded ſeveral Chriſtians from Offices, which makes the Writers of thoſe times generally inveigh againſt him as a bitter Perſecutor of the Chriſtians, tho he made no ſanguinary Laws againſt them. But the ſucceeding Chriſtian Emperors did not follow his Example, and in Revenge exclude the Heathens: There are Examples of Heathens in the higheſt Poſts in the Court and Camp, and the Civil Government of the Romans in the ſucceeding Reigns of Valentinian, Valens, Gratian, Valentinian the Younger, Theodoſius, Honorius, Arcadius, Theodoſius the Younger, Juſtin and Juſtinian. Such were Fravita and Generilus two Generals; Pompeian a Prefect of the City, with divers others. Symmachus was ſent Embaſſador by the Senate of Rome, to pray for an encreaſe of the number of Veſtal Virgins. Hiſt. Zozim. l. 4. circa fin. l. 5. Socr. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 8. c. 13. l. 6. c. 8.

The narrowing Laws began with Popery. After Rome became Papal, ſhe preſently anſwer'd her Character, and let no body buy nor ſell but thoſe who had the Mark or the Name of the Beaſt, or the number of his Name: By this means engroſſing all Power and Privileges, and diſpenſing them only to her Votarys. This is the perſecuting Spirit, and the moſt pernicious practice of Antichriſt, inaſmuch as 'tis one of the greateſt Engines to ſupport her pretended Infallibility, the very Quinteſſence of that Myſtery of Iniquity. 'Twere to be wiſhed that the Reformation had driven out of the World this carnal Spirit: whereas we can ſcarce give an Inſtance of any Reform'd Country where 'tis entirely baniſh'd. We ſeem to have cheriſh'd it too much of late in our own Nation, which has been on other accounts thought the head of the Proteſtant Intereſt: And have ſince the Reſtoration not only narrow'd the Church, but made ſeveral Laws to exclude Proteſtant Diſſenters from Employments in the State, which too many ſeem to build other narrow Notions upon, and deſirous to enforce by other incapacitating Laws, inſtead of endeavouring that they ſhould be unexecuted or repeal'd.

of

of this Paragraph, in his ſecond, third and fourth Editions, when his leiſure gave him opportunity to correct an Omiſſion in the ſecond Paragraph of the third Page of his Dedication.

But to return to Sir H's Exceptions: Let us ſuppoſe that they ſignify what they wou'd have done, if [notwithſtanding] or ſome ſynonymous word had been added, and ſo they had been made to run thus. 'All wiſe Na-'tions in the World, how different ſoever their Conſti-'tution of Government may be in other reſpects, and [notwithſtanding] [inſtead of 'whatever'] what has 'been practis'd in antient Times, in particular Caſes, or on 'extraordinary Occaſions, &c. which is what, I ſuppoſe, Sir H. means by this Paragraph; and yet I confeſs after I have found out his meaning, I have no ſmall difficulty to find out a good one. For beſides that ſome of theſe Exceptions are groundleſs, and that others are within our Caſe, which Sir H. wou'd by no means have excepted; the Exceptions are larger than the Rule it ſelf, and then we may eaſily gueſs how juſt the Rule is, that Sir H. wou'd have us go by. Why (1.) ſhou'd *Antient Times* be excepted? Is not the Wiſdom of the Antients, who had more Virtue, and made a far greater figure than any Modern Country can pretend to, worth the conſidering, as well as the Conceits of to day or yeſterday? Poſſibly Sir H. ſaw that the Wiſdom of the Antients was againſt him, and ſo wiſely excepted their Example out of the Rule. But methinks if he ſaw antient Prudence againſt him, it was not ſo fair to pretend to Modern Precedents without anſwering thoſe Authoritys: Since the earlier Ages of the World reap'd as many Advantages by giving Liberty to all Diſſenting Subjects and naturalizing Foreigners, as we do Diſadvantages by our ſecluding Laws. And if Sir H. cou'd diſpenſe with himſelf from anſwering theſe Authoritys, I think he

cou'd

cou'd not complain, if we ſhou'd neither value nor anſwer his Precedents from Nations, that are infinitely inferior to the Antients in Valor, Wiſdom and Succeſs.

And why does Sir H. (2.) except thoſe Nations that *have not ſettled a national Religion by ſuch Acts of Uniformity* as we have? How does this Exception conſiſt with his Aſſertion, 'That all wiſe Nations in the 'World agree, that there is an abſolute neceſſity of an 'Eſtabliſh'd Religion and a National Church'? For if all Nations have ſettled a national Religion, his Aſſertion might have been ſafe enough, without excepting thoſe that ha'nt. But to let that paſs, we muſt here obſerve, that if there are Nations which have not ſettled a National Religion by Acts of State, and yet have been as peaceable and proſperous as thoſe that have, their Story may be as juſtly pleaded againſt the Excluſion of Diſſenters, as the Story of other Nations for it, who have ſettled a National Religion by Acts of State. And when Sir H. not only excepts Nations that have not ſettled a National Religion, but thoſe that have not ſettled it by ſuch an Act of State, as the Act of Uniformity is in this Kingdom, he may for ought I know have made ſo large an Exception, as to have taken in his Aſſertion, and ſo left us no Aſſertion at all. For if no Nation has ſuch an Act of Uniformity as ours, as I don't know that any has, then Sir H. don't aſſert that any wiſe Nation has excluded Diſſenters from publick Employments. B. p. 1. §. 1.

But if he has not excepted his Aſſertion, I'm ſure (3.) he has excepted the Caſe before us out of it, when he excepts all *particular Caſes and extraordinary Occaſions.* For no Caſe can be Particular, if the Caſe of ſober, induſtrious, peaceable Men, that have the Capacity and Integrity requiſite to diſcharge the Duty of an Office, and who ſubſiſt by it, be not ſo? and that is the Caſe of many Diſſenters whom this Bill wou'd exclude.

clude. Nor can any Occaſion be extraordinary, if ours is not, who are neither engag'd in an unjuſt War, nor a trifling one: But in a Contention with the potent Monarchys of France and Spain; with the Craft of a Politic Prince, and the Treaſures of the Indys; for all that Free Men or Proteſtants can think worth the fighting for: And who were unhappily convinc'd by the laſt War, that one of theſe Enemys was not over-match'd by all the reſt of the Confederated Force of Europe. In one word, what can be the extraordinary Occaſion, in which Sir *H.* is not unwilling to admit Diſſenters into Offices, if it be not this, when we have the moſt valuable things to contend for, and the moſt united Strength to contend with, and when we conſequently want all our joint Powers to oppoſe it? So that if he means any thing by this laſt Exception, he means the ſame that he elſewhere finds
B.p.10.§.3. fault with the Lords for, and confirms what their Lordſhips ſo prudently aſſerted againſt his own Cavils, viz. 'That tho there may be ſome things to be found fault 'with, yet in a time of War, Alterations (ſuch, I ſuppoſe, are meant as an excluding Bill wou'd make) 'are 'not only unneceſſary but dangerous.

3. But tho theſe Exceptions are groundleſs and arbitrary, yet Sir H's Aſſertion does *not hold good in Holland*, which according to our Author is *not excepted.* For ſhe is one of our Proteſtant Allys, of whom he af-
B.p.7.§ 5. firms it in general, 'That they have all of 'em National 'Churches, and keep Diſſenters from it out of the Ad-'miniſtration'. But Sir H. upon Enquiry will find himſelf miſtaken as to Holland, tho that Commonwealth has been the Authority pretended to by all the Advocates for the Occaſional Conformity Bill: From whom poſſibly he has taken this matter of fact upon truſt. The United Provinces admit all Diſſenters to Military Employments by Sea and Land, without excluding Papiſts,

Papiſts, and not without very good Service from them. 'Slangenburgh,' a Popiſh General, gain'd a Victory the laſt Summer by his Fidelity and Courage; when a General, that was a Conformiſt to the National Church, had thro Treachery and Cowardice loſt it and fled. By making it the Intereſt of the Papiſts to be true to the Government, thro their good uſage of 'em in the Army, they have made them ſo againſt the very Principles of a Papiſt, which lead 'em to betray it. So much Intereſt ſometimes gets the better of Principles, tho Mens Principles ſeldom get the better of their Intereſt.

They admit Members of the *Engliſh, Scotch and Walloon Churches* indifferently to the Legiſlature, and to all Civil Employments: Tho if a Subjection to another Eccleſiaſtical Authority, or ſome little differences in Worſhip or Diſcipline, make a man a Diſſenter from the Eſtabliſhment; the Engliſh, Scotch and Walloon Churches are Diſſenters from the Dutch Eſtabliſhment.

Nor are the *Arminians* excluded from making and executing of Laws by any Statute, tho they are a Faction in the State, and have always oppos'd the Authority of the Princes of Orange: Upon that account indeed they have ſeldom had the Favor of the Government, and the Intereſt of that Houſe has generally kept the Body of 'em out of Offices and public Employments, and ſometimes perhaps forcibly thruſt 'em out of 'em. But they are excluded by no Law, and ſome few of 'em have all along had conſiderable Poſts both in particular Towns and Provinces, and in the Employments of the General Union *: And have now a very prevailing Intereſt. A common effect of the violence of one Party, at laſt to raiſe the other.

---

* *For proof of this ſee the Extract of a Letter hereunto annext.*

No Law requires any Perſon in public Employment (I only ſpeak of Proteſtants employ'd in the Civil Government in Holland) *to take* Religious Oaths, to ſubſcribe or abjure any Articles; or commands 'em to take the Sacrament with the Eſtabliſh'd Church, or not to frequent or communicate with any other. People indeed that have Civil Employments in Holland, generally receive the Sacrament once a year with the Dutch Church, or with the Diſſenting Churches of the Engliſh, Scots or Walloons; but even this is done to comply with the common Cuſtom, or to have the better Credit with the Government or the People, who are not free from all Bigotry and narrow Principles any more than their Neighbours; but not in obedience to any Law by which it is enjoin'd.

4. So that one wou'd think Sir H. had his Eye upon *Italy, Portugal, France, and Spain*, and meant them, when he ſaid that all wiſe Nations truſted the Adminiſtration of Government with men of the ſame perſuaſion in matters of Religion: And 'tis theſe Countrys that Sir H's Defender produces as Inſtances to prove this Aſſertion. But 'tis *falſe in Fact*, that theſe Countrys admit none to Offices that are of different perſuaſions in matters of Religion; ſince they admit Papiſts of all ſorts, who differ as much among themſelves in matters of Religion, as Proteſtants do in our Country or in any other. Indeed there are but a very few of theſe Countrys that admit any to Offices but Men of the ſame Communion. But even all Popiſh Countrys don't exclude Men of a different Communion neither: Particularly the Republick of Venice, fam'd for her Conſtitution and Politics, admits Proteſtants to Military Employments. And this is to be ſaid for thoſe Popiſh Countrys that don't, that their Communion is very large. For tho the Romiſh Religion be made up of an innumerable company of Rites and Cere-

Peace and Union, or a defence of Sir H. M. p. 4. §. 2.

Ceremonys, and a thouſand fabulous Legends and Traditions, ſhe allows three hundred Differences in her Communion, and makes the Belief of the Pope's Supremacy the only neceſſary Qualification for it. Whereas we, who pretend to have reform'd from the Fables and Superſtitions of that Church, make a great many things neceſſary to our Communion, which are not neceſſary to make a man a Chriſtian. So that after we have narrow'd the Church ſo much, we have leſs reaſon to reſtrain Civil Offices to Members of its Communion than the Papiſts. But if we had as much reaſon to do it as they, yet thoſe Countrys wou'd be *no Proof* of Sir H's Aſſertion; becauſe they give no Indulgence to Conſciences truly ſcrupulous: Whereas granting a Toleration is one of the Characters, by which he has limited his general Poſition. For he ſays, 'that thoſe wiſe Nations, who give the 'greateſt Indulgence to Conſciences truly ſcrupulous, 'agree, that 'tis neceſſary to preſerve the Adminiſtration 'in Perſons of one and the ſame Perſuaſion. B.p. 1. §. 1.

5. So that I'm perfectly at a loſs where to find Proofs for Sir H's Aſſertion. And after peruſing his Treatiſe, I can find but *one ſingle Inſtance*, and that but of one Country, to prove this univerſal Agreement. Much like the Proof that He elſewhere gives of a general Opinion of the Diſſenters, and of a public Declaration of ſome of them in their Writings; for which he produces but one ſingle Quotation, without referring us to the Book whence 'tis taken: But which is to be found in a certain Pamphlet, writ by an Author, who was neither fit to be nam'd to her Majeſty, nor to be produc'd as an Evidence in this Cauſe. Ded. p. 2. §. 2. *An Enquiry into Occaſ. Conform. By Dan. de Foe.*

II. The ſingle Inſtance Sir H. produces, is that of France under Henry III. But ſuppoſing this to be a good Inſtance, and that he had a thouſand others of every wiſe Nation under heaven, who had thought fit to put the Adminiſtration of Affairs into hands of men of one Ded. p. 3. §. 2.

and

and the ſame Perſuaſion; yet this Practice wou'd *not be fit for our Imitation*, till Sir H. had prov'd that it was a part of their Wiſdom (the other thing that goes to make up an Example) and conſequently that it was a Practice which deſerves our Imitation. But we have anticipated our ſelves here, and have prov'd at large that the Admiſſion of Diſſenters is ſo far from being inconſiſtent with the Safety of Church and State, that it is their Right, and the Government's Intereſt.

And this is all that I think neceſſary to be ſaid to prove in general, that if the different Nations of Europe were as wiſe in this matter as Sir H. repreſents 'em, they wou'd be but very bad Examples. I ſhall only juſt ſhew *in particular*, that the Inſtance Sir H. mentions upon Dr. Davenant's Authority, is very unworthy of our Imitation. Two Remarks will evince this very fully. (1.) Henry III. who did not think fit to truſt the Hugonots in the Adminiſtration, did not think 'em fit to live, and therefore conſented to the horrid Maſſacre at Paris. (2) It appears in the ſame Eſſay, from whence Sir H. takes this Inſtance, that the Union this Excluſion introduc'd was fatal to the King and to the Diſſenters. For a Perſecution was rais'd upon the Hugonots after their Excluſion; and the King having given all the Power into the hands of the eſtabliſh'd Church, was forc'd to ſubmit to all their Meaſures. And after he had call'd in the Aſſiſtance of his diſſenting Subjects to defend himſelf from the fiery Temper of that powerful Faction the League, he was at laſt murder'd by a Member of the Eſtabliſhment, at whoſe Sollicitation the Hugonots had been excluded.

Ded. p. 3. §. 2.

Davila's Hiſt. of the Civ. War of France, p. 347, 369.

Dr. Davenant's Eſſays of War at home and Peace abroad, Part I. p. 237, 238.

Davila's Hiſt. p. 800.

P. 817.

And to ſhew that this is the Deſign, or at leaſt the Conſequence of ſuch Meaſures, the ſame thing has happen'd to the Hugonots under the Conduct of the preſent moſt Chriſtian King; who firſt by his Adminiſtration, Judgments of his Courts of Juſtice, and Ordinances, gradually excluded the Hugonots from all public Employments, and

Hiſtoire de l'Edit de Nantes, Tome 3. Partie 1, 2.

and when by this means he thought the Hugonots ſufficiently weakned, repeal'd the Edict of Nants. Tho I don't queſtion but he told the Hugonots as fine Storys upon the publiſhing of his excluding Ordinances, as thoſe with which Sir H. is pleas'd to ſooth the Diſſenters. 'Twas without queſtion given out, 'that the Deſign was only that matters being happily ſettled, that the Church having his 'Majeſty's Favor, and the Hugonots his Protection; 'that both being ſecure from the Danger of one another, 'and each of them knowing the Extent of their Privileges; that the Church having no Power or Provocation to proſecute the Hugonots, nor any Hugonots 'being permitted to get into public Employments, 'whereby they might be enabled one time or another to 'deſtroy the eſtabliſh'd Church; that the Prince and his 'Princely Succeſſors being ſecur'd from a Party, whoſe 'Principles muſt end in the ruin of the Monarchy, and the 'Hugonots themſelves being ſecur'd by removing the 'occaſion of thoſe Fears and Jealouſys which had ever 'been the cauſe of their Proſecution, the great Bleſſing 'of Unity and Uniformity might be obtain'd in Church 'and State.' But as this Unity and Uniformity it ſelf was a great curſe to Henry III. and wou'd have been to Lewis XIV. if he had not had a ſtanding Army, ſo 'tis the greateſt Unhappineſs that cou'd have befallen that Country in general, and the Hugonots in particular; and ſerv'd in both thoſe Reigns only as the Prologue to the terrible Scene that immediately ſucceeded in the Confiſcation and Proſcription of all the Proteſtants, and at laſt in the utter Extirpation of the Reform'd Religion out of that Country.

Tome 3. Partie 3. Ded. p. 2. B. p. 11, §. 12.

This is the Strength that Hiſtory gives to Sir H's Cauſe. Let us ſee what Aſſiſtance it has *from the Law.* Sir H. inſiſts upon this very often. Sometimes he lays it down, that the *Admiſſion of Diſſenters into Offices is inconſiſtent with the plain Intent and Meaning of the Corporation and Teſt*

B. p. 4. §. 3.

B. p. 2. §. 3, 4. *Teſt Acts*: 'And ſometimes, that a Bill to exclude Diſſenters 'is to hinder thoſe Laws from being evaded, and to en- 'force 'em, and to make 'em more effectual.

I. The words of a Law can only diſcover its plain Intent and Meaning, and ſhew us whether 'tis evaded, or wants to be enforc'd. 1: Now the Qualification requir'd by the Corporation Act being only to receive the Sacrament according to the Uſage of the Church of England, once within a year before the entring upon an Office; and the Qualification requir'd by the Teſt Act being only to receive the Sacrament according to the Uſage of the Church of England, once within three months after the Admiſſion to an Office; no Diſſenter is excluded by thoſe Laws, but he that has not taken the Sacrament a year before he enters upon any Office, contain'd in the one, and three months after he's admitted to any, contain'd in the other. So that thoſe Acts don't exclude Diſſenters, but *only Diſſenters that never conform* at all. But a Diſſenter conforming once within a year before, or three months after he's admitted to his Office, is qualify'd according to the plain Intent and Meaning of thoſe Laws, as much as any Churchman whatſoever; and has been always thought ſo in Weſtminſter-Hall, the proper Judg of the plain Intent and Meaning of our Laws. Nor was it ever thought to be an Evaſion of their plain Intent and Meaning, that a Man ſhou'd go to a Meeting after he had receiv'd the Sacrament within a year before, or three months after his Admiſſion to an Office, to qualify himſelf for that Office, till ſome ſuch Light diſcover'd it to be ſo, as gave Sir H. to ſee, that the King's Right to levy Cuſtoms without Act of Parliament, was a Law as binding as Magna Charta, and much more antient.

B. p. 1. §. 4. Sir H. indeed, to ſupport his Opinion, ſays, 'that 'thoſe Laws requiring all Officers to receive the Sacra- 'ment of the Lord's Supper according to the Rites and 'Uſage of the Church of England, did provide that no

'Perſons ſhou'd be admitted to Offices, but ſuch as did 'appear *to be true Members of the Church*,' i. e. no Perſons that ever go to a Meeting; for that is what Sir H. means by true Members of the Church. Well, but how does it follow from their making the Sacrament the Teſt, that they deſign'd no man who ever afterwards went to a Meeting, ſhou'd be admitted to an Office? Why becauſe 'the Diſſenters then refus'd ever B.p.2.§.1. 'to receive the Sacrament according to the Rites of the 'Church. But how does that appear? Why (1.) 'by 'their general Practices in thoſe days. (2.) By the Ar-'guments which were then chiefly made uſe of to juſtify 'their Separation. (3.) By the common Language of 'the Diſſenters, in which, it ſhou'd ſeem, receiving the 'Sacrament according to the Rites of the Church of 'England was no leſs than Popery and Idolatry.' I will freely allow it to Sir H. that thoſe Laws did provide againſt the admiſſion of Perſons into Offices, who wou'd not receive the Sacrament after the Uſage of the Church of England. But who were they? Sir H. don't tell us. If he had indeed prov'd it upon any Set of Diſſenters in thoſe days, that they never receiv'd the Sacrament with the Church of England; if he had given us the particular Arguments by which they juſtify'd their Separation; or if he had fix'd the calling Communion with the Church of England Popery and Idolatry, upon any particular Denomination of Nonconformiſts, we might have eaſily collected from thence what ſort of Nonconformiſts they were, that refus'd to receive the Sacrament with the Church. But Sir H. expects we ſhou'd gueſs his meaning, and believe his Arguments and Aſſertions, after he has couch'd 'em in his quaint Periods, upon his bare Credit, without any Evidence, or any neceſſary Conſequence to ſupport 'em.

But I hope Sir H. will forgive my Dulneſs and Infidelity, and allow me to tell him, that if the Prac-

tice, Arguments, or ill Language he wou'd charge upon all the Diſſenters of thoſe days, belong to any, it is to the Sectarys which then abounded, the Familiſts, Quakers, Ranters, Behmeniſts, Vaniſts, Muggletonians, &c. But he might have eaſily known, that they did not belong to all the Diſſenters; and particularly that they were *not chargeable* upon the *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, the only Diſſenters immediately affected by this Bill, and upon whom Sir H. without all doubt had his ey. To have been inform'd of this he need only have conſulted Dr. Stillingfleet's famous Sermon on the Unreaſonableneſs of Separation, reprinted lately for the Conviction of the Diſſenters, where he'd have found the Independents quoted as 'owning the Pariſh Churches to be true Churches, and complaining that they have been traduc'd, 'by ſaying, that they look upon 'em as no true ones. He might there have learnt too, 'that the Presbyterians 'immediately after the Act of Uniformity, unanimouſly 'agreed, at a Meeting, held to conſider how far it was 'lawful or a duty to hold Communion with their Pariſh 'Churches; that it was lawful and a duty to ſome, to 'join with ſome Pariſh Churches three times in a year 'in the Lord's Supper.' And fewer ſcrupl'd it at the time of the Corporation Act, which was paſs'd in 60, two years before the Act of Uniformity, than ſcrupl'd it after the paſſing of the Uniformity Act, by which the Church receiv'd very great Alterations.

Unreaſ. of Separ. p. 21, 22.

How unjuſtly then does Sir H. accuſe the generality of the Diſſenters in thoſe days, of giving ſuch hard and unchriſtian Language to the Church? And how much more unjuſtly does he accuſe the Diſſenters of our days 'of ſetting up a diſpenſing Power in their Conſciences, and of 'overturning all Laws for their advantage;' who have never expreſs'd any ſuch Opinions of the Church, nor can't be concluded to have any ſuch, tho it were true that their Predeceſſors had? Nay, when Sir H. no where pretends

B.p.2.§.2.

that

that Occaſional Conformity is againſt the Principles of the modern Diſſenters, and muſt needs know that 'tis juſt the contrary.

2. But it may be, inſtead of ſaying that the Admiſſion of Diſſenters into Offices is inconſiſtent with the plain Intent and Meaning of theſe Laws, Sir H. meant to ſay, that it was contrary to the *plain Intent and Meaning of the Law-givers*. And this I ſhou'd the rather take to be his Meaning, becauſe he inſiſts ſo much upon the Occaſion, Title, and Preamble of thoſe Acts, to prove that the Admiſſion of Diſſenters to Offices is againſt the Intent and Meaning of thoſe Laws: From whence good Arguments may be drawn to evince the Deſign of the Law-makers, but not the plain Intent and Meaning of a Law, which cannot be poſitively collected from thence, and muſt rather be infer'd from the enacting Part of the Law. But if Sir H. wou'd have dealt candidly with his Reader, he wou'd not have ſo much as pretended to prove by thoſe Topics, that the Admiſſion of Diſſenters into Offices was inconſiſtent with the *Deſign of the Framers of the Teſt Act*. For tho he talks of the Occaſion and Preamble of both theſe Acts, yet he muſt needs know, that the Occaſion and Preamble he there ſpeaks of as common to both theſe Acts, belong only to the firſt of 'em; for he ſcarce ſays one word in all that Paragraph, that properly belongs to the other. I confeſs this confounding of the Corporation with the Teſt Act does Sir H. a great deal of Service. The Teſt Act having more Credit than the other, which was a Law paſs'd in a heat and a hurry; and which enacted ſeveral things that were excuſable upon no other account. For it gave perhaps as extravagant a Power to K. Charles II. as was thought to be an inſupportable Grievance, when aſſum'd by the late King James. Beſides that 'tis an Act which has never had any countenance, nor was ever thought fit to be enforc'd. Some parts of it are expir'd, and others have been repeal'd, as having been found abſolutely inconſiſtent with

the Preſervation of our Libertys at the Revolution. But whatever ſervice Sir H. might think to do his Cauſe by coupling the Corporation and Teſt Acts together, and by inducing his Reader to believe, that the Occaſion, Preamble, and Deſign of the one, was the Occaſion, Preamble, and Deſign of the other; yet I think it was not ſo candid 'to depend ſolely on the Weakneſs of his Reader's Judgment,' and to occaſion his miſtake, as he has done here: Unleſs one may define Sir H's Candor according to an Inſtance of it, (where others that were not ſo ſharp-ſighted wou'd not diſcover much Candor) which he makes to conſiſt in 'conniving at a ſcandalous Practice.'

Pref. p. 2. §. 3.

But that we mayn't diſmiſs this Head, without ſhewing in particular, that it was not the Deſign of the Framers of either of theſe Acts to exclude all Diſſenters from Offices, it may be obſerv'd, That there is not the leaſt pretence to ſay, that it was the *Deſign of the Framers of the Corporation Act* to exclude all Diſſenters from Offices, that wou'd not receive the Sacrament according to the Uſage of the preſent Church of England; becauſe that Act was paſs'd before the Act of Uniformity in the Reign of K. Charles II, which conſtitutes and denominates the preſent Church of England, and makes it differ very widely from that which was the Church of England when the Corporation Act was made. So that unleſs the Framers of that Act had the Spirit of Prophecy to foreſee the Changes the Church wou'd undergo, it cou'd not have been their Deſign to exclude all Diſſenters from Offices, that wou'd not receive the Sacrament with the preſent and modern Church of England.

And Sir H. don't pretend to prove in particular, that it was the *deſign of the Framers of the Teſt Act* to do it. And the great Patron, the Occaſion, Title, Preamble and Enacting part of that Law are ſo many Arguments to ſhew, that the deſign of the Framers of it was only to exclude Popiſh Recuſants. Indeed Sir H. ſays, 'That the Corporation and Teſt Acts have been eſteem'd for ſeveral 'Reigns

Earl of Shaftsbury.

R. p. 2. §. 4.

'Reigns the great Bulwark of the Eſtabliſh'd Govern-
'ment againſt Popiſh Recuſants and Proteſtant Diſſen-
'ters; and that one great Complaint upon the Revolu-
'tion, was the attempt that had been made to repeal
'thoſe Laws.' To ſuſpend 'em by virtue of the King's Prerogative, Sir H. ſhou'd have ſaid, if he had not miſtook what he was talking of, or had had no mind to be miſtaken. If he had ſaid, that the attempt made to ſuſpend the Laws by virtue of the King's Prerogative, was one great Complaint upon the Revolution, he had ſaid true indeed, but nothing that cou'd make at all to his purpoſe. His deſign being to prove, that the Corporation and Teſt Acts were thought the great Bulwark of the Church againſt Proteſtant Diſſenters, as well as Popiſh Recuſants; which a general Complaint againſt a deſign to ſuſpend thoſe Acts by the Prerogative a little before the Revolution, does not argue. Indeed what Sir H. ſays, viz. 'that
'the deſign to repeal thoſe Laws was a general Complaint
'upon the Revolution', wou'd be a better Argument to prove, that they were generally thought a Bulwark againſt the Diſſenters, if it were true that there had been ſuch a Complaint. But Sir H. muſt needs know that there was no Complaint againſt the Deſign to repeal 'em, as far as they affected the Diſſenters. For it is very notorious, that great Promiſes of a grateful Acknowledgment were made by the Church to the Diſſenters, whenever it ſhou'd be in her power, if they wou'd not fall in with K. James's meaſures*.

After

* *The Biſhops in their Petition to K. James aſſure him,* That their Unwillingneſs to read his Declaration, did not proceed from any want of Duty and Obedience to his Majeſty, nor from any want of due Tenderneſs to Diſſenters, in relation to whom they were willing to come to ſuch a Temper, as ſhou'd be thought fit, when that matter ſhou'd be conſider'd. —*And in their Advice to the ſaid King,* They deſire his Majeſty to iſſue out Writs for a Free and Regular Parliament, in which the Church of England might be ſecur'd according to the Act of Uniformity, *and Proviſion made for a due Liberty of Conſcience.* —*And in the account of that Advice, entitul'd, An Account of the late Propoſals made by the Archbiſhop, with ſome other Biſhops to his Majeſty, in a Letter to M. B. Eſq;* the Author has this Paſſage: I do aſſure you, and I'm certain I have the beſt grounds in the whole World for my Aſſurance, that the Biſhops will never

After the Revolution, the late K. William of ever glorious Memory, in one of his Speeches to the Parliament in 89, told 'em, 'He hop'd they wou'd leave room for the Admiſſion of all Proteſtants, that were willing and able 'to ſerve him; which was a thing wou'd tend to the 'better uniting 'em amongſt themſelves, and the ſtrengthning 'em againſt their common Adverſarys. Purſuant whereto, when the Act for abrogating the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, and appointing other Oaths, was read a third time in the Houſe of Lords, a Clauſe was propos'd to be added, to make the receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in any Proteſtant Congregation, a ſufficient Qualification for any Office. So that a repealing of theſe Laws ſeems to have been promis'd and deſign'd before the Revolution, and an attempt was actually made to repeal 'em after it. So far is it from being true, that an attempt to repeal theſe Laws, in favor of the Diſſenters, was one of the great Complaints upon the Revolution.

But ſuppoſing it was contrary to the deſign of the Framers of theſe Laws, that any man that goes to a Meeting ſhou'd be admitted to Offices, it will *make nothing* to Sir *H's Cauſe*, nor to his Argument; which can only be ſerv'd by proving, that the Admiſſion of Diſſenters to Offices is contrary to the plain Intent and Meaning of the Laws. And putting the Caſe even that it were the plain Intent and Meaning of the Teſt Act, it wou'd yet be the *worſt Policy*

---

never ſtir one jot from their Petition; *but they will, whenever that happy Opportunity ſhall offer it ſelf, let the Proteſtant Diſſenters find, that they will be better than their Word given in their famous Petition.—The Bp of Sarum in an Apology for the Church of England, with relation to the Spirit of Perſecution, with which ſhe is accus'd*, ſays, p. 92. *That if the Church of England after ſhe has got out of this Storm, will return to hearken to the Peeviſhneſs of ſome four Men, ſhe will be abandon'd both of God and Man, and will ſet both Heaven and Earth againſt her: The Nation ſees too viſibly*, adds he, *how dear the Diſpute about Conformity has coſt us, to ſtand any more upon ſuch Punctilio's.—And indeed if any Argument were wanting to compleat the Certainty of this Point, the wiſe and generous Behaviour of the main Body of Diſſenters in this preſent Juncture, has given them ſo juſt a Title to our Friendſhip, that we muſt reſolve to ſet all the World againſt us, if we can ever forget it, and if we do not make 'em all the returns of Eaſe and Favor when it is in our Power to do it.*

in the Government, and *the higheſt Ingratitude* to the Diſſenters imaginable, to turn an Act upon them, which, as a very Learned Prelate obſerves, was procur'd for our common ſecurity by their Aſſiſtance. *Biſhop of Salisb. Speech, p. 3. col. 1.*

II. But to go one ſtep farther. Suppoſing it were both the plain Intent and Meaning of theſe Laws, and had been the Intent of thoſe that made 'em, to exclude any Man that goes to a Meeting from all Offices; and ſuppoſing that the Diſſenters had had no hand in procuring 'em, yet thoſe that made theſe Laws may have been miſtaken. And unleſs the Laws and Intention of the Lawgivers appear to be juſt and advantageous, there's *no Reaſon that they ſhould be enforc'd.* And when they are found to be ſevere, and prejudicial to the Community, there's all the Reaſon in the World that *they ſhou'd be repeal'd.* Several Parts of the Corporation Act have been repeal'd already, as being highly unreaſonable and inconſiſtent with the Liberty of the Subject. And there's no doubt but other Barrs might be found out to prevent the Intruſion of Papiſts into Offices, beſides thoſe which keep out ſome Diſſenters. And if theſe or any other Laws ſhou'd be found inconſiſtent with the Toleration, which is ſo unqueſtionable and unalienable a Right of Mankind, we ought to be ſo far from enforcing 'em as good Laws, or arguing from 'em as inconteſted Principles, that we ought much rather to give 'em the ſame fate, that the other penal Laws had at the Revolution; with which they ought in all propriety to have been bury'd: That having been the time when Perſecution and Slavery receiv'd its deadly Wound, and our Libertys a Reſurrection.

By all this it appears, that the moſt finiſh'd Prudence and Integrity conducted the Proceedings of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, in oppoſing the Occaſional Conformity Bill. A Bill which had no Precedent in Free Countrys, till Popery had overſpread this part of the World.

World. Nor any thing like a Precedent in our own, till a Prince that Dr. Davenant tells us was a Papiſt, and who may juſtly be ſuppos'd to have had deſigns to bring in Popery among us, procur'd a Law at his Reſtoration, which this Bill was pretended to enforce. By rejecting it their Lordſhips have ſecur'd the Queen's Prerogative, the Libertys of the People, and the Privileges of their own Houſe. For ſince the beſt ſecurity of Powers and Privileges is a good uſe of 'em, by preſerving our Rights they have ſecur'd their own, as by maintaining their own they have ſecur'd ours. For by this means they have prevented the Reſumtion of Power from the true Friends of the Government, and the perpetuating of it in the hands of its dangerous Enemys: And have at the ſame time indemnify'd a Practice, by which Men of all Nations and of all Partys have an opportunity of expreſſing the juſt Veneration they have for the Church; and prevented a Perſecution, by which ſhe muſt have loſt her Credit, and given Reputation to the Diſſenters. Nor cou'd their Lordſhips have taken any greater ſtep than this towards ſecuring the Church from the Rage of her Foreign Enemys, and the mad Zeal of her miſtaken Friends; from the ill will of her own Members, from precluding herſelf from the likelieſt method of making Proſelytes, or from giving a juſt matter of Reproach to any of her Adverſarys.

Eſſays upon Peace at Home and War abroad, p. 219.

The juſt Reſentment of theſe Services from the Houſe of Peers, that are as great as either good Men cou'd wiſh or ill Men fear, and which every honeſt Engliſh-man is big with; and the fair opportunity which this ſhort Recapitulation gives us of expreſſing it to the World, wou'd not allow us to be wholly ſilent: Tho we are happily prevented from entring into any farther Vindication of the Proceedings of my Lords the Biſhops, againſt whom the Cry has been the loudeſt, by 'a Letter to a Clergyman 'in the Country' upon that ſubject, very much to the ſatisfaction of thinking Men, and the juſtification of that Venerable Bench.

FINIS.

A Tranſlation of part of a Letter from Amſterdam, in anſwer to this Queſtion, Whether there was either Cuſtom or Statute that excluded the Remonſtrants from any Offices in Holland.

Amſterdam, April 8. 1704.

SIR,

I Was able immediately to have anſwer'd your Querys concerning the Remonſtrants, becauſe of my frequent Converſation with Mr.——; but not contenting my ſelf with this, I made freſh Enquiries. And that you may ſee what Informations they gave me, you may be aſſur'd that there's no Law that excludes Remonſtrants from publick Offices, of what kind ſoever. 'Tis ſcarce more than twelve years ſince at Amſterdam there was a Burgomaſter, Mr. *Van Loon* by name, who dy'd a Remonſtrant. 'Tis true there was a Faction form'd to exclude him, and Mr. *Witſen* (a Burgomaſter yet living, whom doubtleſs you muſt know by the Map of Muſcovy which he publiſh'd) was of it: He ſignify'd privately to Mr. *Van Loon*, that, if he'd communicate with the National Church, he ſhould be frequently nominated to this Office: But Mr. *Van Loon* conſtantly refus'd to do it. You know that the Government of a Burgomaſter laſts but for a year; and that to be continu'd, or to obtain it two years afterwards, he muſt be choſen anew. In the mean time he has the Title of an old Burgomaſter, and ſome other Employments, as Deputy to the States, tho he is not made any more a Burgomaſter Regent. There are many who have not been ſo more than once. Mr. *Huide* knew nothing of what was ſaid to Mr. *Van Loon*, till 'twas too late to redreſs it: But he proteſted publickly 'twas an Injuſtice, and that if Mr. *Van Loon* had inform'd him of it, he would have put a ſtop to it. This Mr. *Van Loon* was no

Man of Intrigue, he had no Dignities but what came and offer'd themselves to his Acceptance. He has a Son who is Secretary and a Remonstrant, besides a Cousin that has an Employ in the Treasury. A Brother of Mr. *Limbourch* was *Avocat Fiscal* to the States of Holland, with this Circumstance, that when he was nominated, they fear'd he wou'd decline the Employment. Mr. *Overbeek* inform'd me, that a Counsellor told him so as he was going into the Council: Upon which Mr. *Overbeek* desir'd him to stay a moment, while he went to know Mr. *Limbourch*'s Resolution. Mr. *Limbourch* reply'd, that he wou'd accept the Charge if 'twas offer'd to him; but added withal, that they ought to remember he was a Remonstrant, and wou'd continue so: That if he made any Voyages with his Masters, and, in any Place thro which they pass'd, there shou'd be a Church of Remonstrants, he would leave them when they went to the Establish'd Church, and wou'd go to that of his own Persuasion. Notwithstanding this they nominated him. There is yet a Counsellor of State in Holland, whose name is Mr. *Hop*, a Remonstrant. His Son, who is grand Treasurer, and was last year one of the Deputies to the Army, communicates with the Church Establish'd, but often upon Holidays comes to Amsterdam, and communicates with the Remonstrants. There are doubtless many other Remonstrants in publick Offices, especially at Roterdam. Perhaps too there will be more now, for they are not so much hated as they were: If there have not been many, 'tis an Abuse, and not by virtue of any Law against 'em. As to the Offices in the Army, Religion is no impediment at all: Papists are admitted to 'em as well as others, nor is it so much as necessary that the Person be a Hollander.

ERRATA.

PAG. 2. lin. 9. dele *against*. P. 3. l. 26. d. *i. e. the House of Commons*. P. 7. l. 14. for *neither the Danger*, r. *neither the preventing of the Danger*. P. 30. l. 13. for *as we now*, r. *as Candidates think we now*. P. 42. l. 32. d. *or danger*.

There are some other less material Faults, which the Reader is desired to excuse by reason of the Author's Absence.

FINIS.

